LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 2 4 2003
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ANGLO-AMERICAN EDITION.

Prof. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., General Editor, New York.

Prof. CHARLES A. AIKEN, D.D. ..... Princeton, N. J.
Rev. S. R. ASBURY, M.A. ..... Moorestown, N. J.
Prof. GEO. BLISS, D.D. ..... Upland, Pa.
Prof. CHAS. A. BRIGGS ..... New York.
Prof. JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D. ..... Greenville, S. C.
Rev. T. W. CHAMBERS, D.D. ..... New York.
Rev. THOMAS C. CONANT, D.D. ..... Brooklyn, L. I.
Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D.D. ..... Newark, N. J.
Chancellor HOWARD CROSBY, D.D. ..... New York.
Prof. GEO. E. DAY, D.D. ..... New Haven, Conn.
Prof. CHAS. ELLIOTT, D.D. ..... Chicago, Ill.
Prof. L. J. EVANS, D.D. ..... Cincinnati, O.
Prof. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN ..... Glasgow, Scotland.
Rev. WILLIAM FINDLAY ..... Larkhall, Scotland.
Prof. JOHN FORSYTH, D.D. ..... West Point, N. Y.
Prof. FRED. GARDINER, D.D. ..... Middletown, Conn.
Rev. A. GOSMAN, D.D. ..... Lawrenceville, N. J.
Prof. W. H. GREEN, D.D. ..... Princeton, N. J.
Prof. H. B. HACKETT, D.D. ..... Rochester, N. Y.
Rev. E. HARWOOD, D.D. ..... New Haven, Conn.
Prof. W. H. HORNBLOWER, D.D. ..... Alleghany, Pa.
Prof. J. F. HURST, D.D. ..... Madison, N. J.
Prof. M. W. JACOBUS, D.D. ..... Alleghany, Pa.
Prof. A. C. KENDRICK, D.D. ..... Rochester, N. Y.
Prof. SAM. T. LOWREY, D.D. ..... Alleghany, Pa.
Rev. JOHN LILLIE, D.D. ..... Kingston, N. Y.
Prof. J. FRED. McCURDY ..... Princeton, N. J.
Prof. C. M. MEAD, M.A. ..... Andover, Mass.
Rev. J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D.D. ..... Dresden, Germany.
Miss EVELINE MOORE ..... Newark, N. J.
Prof. MURPHY, D.D. ..... Belfast, Ireland.
Prof. HOWARD OSGOOD, D.D. ..... Rochester, N. Y.
Prof. J. PACKARD, D.D. ..... Alexandria, Va.
Prof. D. W. POOR, D.D. ..... San Francisco, Cal.
Prof. M. B. RIDDLE, D.D. ..... Hartford, Conn.
Prof. CH. F. SCHAEFFER, D.D. ..... Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. W. G. T. SHEDD, D.D. ..... New York.
Rev. W. SHELDON, M.A. ..... Princeton, N. J.
Rev. C. C. STARBUCK ..... Kenyon College, Ky.
Prof. P. H. STEENSTRA ..... Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. JAS. STRONG, D.D. ..... Madison, N. J.
Prof. W. G. SUMNER ..... New Haven, Conn.
Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D. ..... Schenectady, N. Y.
Prof. C. H. TOY, D.D. ..... Greenville, S. C.
Rev. E. A. WASHBURN, D.D. ..... New York.
Prof. WILLIAM WELLS ..... Schenectady, N. Y.
Rev. C. P. WING, D.D. ..... Carlisle, Pa.
Prof. JOHN H. WOODS ..... Jacksonville, Ill.
Rev. E. D. YEOMANS, D.D. ..... Orange, N. J.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS TO THE GERMAN EDITION.

Prof. JOHN P. LANGE, D.D., General Editor, Bonn.

Prof. C. A. AUBERLEN, D.D (deceased) ..... Basle.
Rev. KARL C. W. F. BAEHR, D.D. (dec.) ..... Carlsruhe.
Gen. Supt. KARL BRAUNE, D.D. ..... Altenburg.
Gen. Supt. CHR. FR. D. ERDMANN, D.D. ..... Breslau.
Rev. F. R. FAY ..... Crefeld.
Rev. G. F. C. FRONMUELLER, PH.D. ..... Kemnath.
Rev. KARL GEROK, D.D. ..... Stuttgart.
Prof. PAUL KLEINERT, PH.D. ..... Berlin.
Rev. CHRIS. FR. KLING, D.D. (dec.) ..... Marbach.
Prof. GOTTL. VICTOR LECHLER, D.D. ..... Leipzig.
Prof. CARL BERN. MOLL, D.D. ..... Königsberg.
Rev. C. W. E. NAEGELSBACH, PH.D. ..... Bayreuth.
Prof. J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D. ..... Utrecht.
Prof. C. J. RIGGENBACH, D.D. ..... Basle.
Prof. OTTO SCHMOLLER, PH. D. ..... Urach.
Rev. FR. WILH. J. SCHROEDER, D.D. ..... Elberfeld.
Prof. F. W. SCHULTZ, D.D. ..... Breslau.
Prof. OTTO ZOECKLER, D.D. ..... Greifswald.

Copyright 1876. By Scribner, Armstrong & Co.

LEVITICUS:

OR,

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES.

BY

FREDERIC GARDINER, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THE LITERATURE AND INTERPRETATION OF THE OLD TESATMENT IN THE BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

IN WHICH IS INCORPORATED

A TRANSLATION OF THE GREATER PART OF THE GERMAN COMMENTARY ON LEVITICUS,

BY

JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

NEW YORK:
SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.

LEVITICUS.

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES.

(וַיִּקְרָא; *Λευιτικον*; *Leviticus.*)

"THE Book of the Sacerdotal Theocracy, or of the Priesthood of Israel, to set forth its typical Holiness."
"THE religious observances by which God's people might be made holy, and kept holy."—LANGE.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. NAME, CONNECTION, OBJECT, AND AUTHORSHIP.

THE writings of Moses have reached us in a five-fold division, the several parts of which have come to be commonly known by the names given to them in the Septuagint and Vulgate. In the Hebrew the whole Pentateuch is divided, as one book, into sections (*Parashiyoth*) for reading in the synagogues on each Sabbath of the year, and the several books are called by the first word of the first section contained in them. Thus the present book is וַיִּקְרָא = *and he called;* it is also called by the Rabbins in the Talmud תּוֹרַת הַכֹּהֲנִים = *Law of the Priests*, and סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת קָרְבָּנוֹת = *Book of the Law of offerings.* In the Septuagint and Vulgate this central book of the Pentateuch is called *Λευιτικὸν* (*βίβλιον*) and *Leviticus* (*liber*) because it has to do with the duties of the priests, the sons of Levi. The Levites, as distinguished from the priests, are mentioned but once, and that incidentally, in the whole book (xxv. 32, 33).

As appears from the Hebrew name, the connection of this book with the one immediately preceding is very close. The tabernacle had now been set up, and its sacred furniture arranged; the book of Exodus closes with the mention of the cloud that covered it, and the Glory of the Lord with which it was filled. Hitherto the Lord had spoken from the cloud on Sinai; now His presence was manifested in the tabernacle from which henceforth He made known His will. It is just at this point that Leviticus is divided from Exodus. The same Lord still speaks to the same people through the same mediator; but He had before spoken from the heights of Sinai, while now He speaks from the sacred tabernacle pitched among His people. At the close Leviticus is also closely connected with, and yet distinctly separated from, the book of Numbers. It embraces substantially the remaining legislation given in the neighborhood of Sinai, while Numbers opens with the military census and other matters preparatory to the march of the Israelites in the second year of the Exodus. Yet on the eve of that march a number of additional commands are given in Numbers intimately associating the two books together.

The whole period between the setting up of the tabernacle (Ex. xl. 17) and the final departure from Mt. Sinai (Num. x. 11) was but one month and twenty days. Much of this was occupied by the events recorded in the earlier chapters of Numbers, especially the offerings of the princes on twelve days (Num. vii.) which must have almost immediately followed the consecration of the priests and the tabernacle (Num. vii. 1 with Lev. viii. 10, 11), and the celebration of the second Passover (ix. 1-5) occupying seven days, and begun on the fourteenth day of the first month. All the events of Leviticus must therefore be included within less than the space of one month.

The object of the Book is apparent from its contents and the circumstances under which it was given, especially when considered in connection with the references to it in the New Testament. Jehovah, having now established the manifestation of His presence among His people, directs them how to approach Him. Primarily, this has reference, of course, to the then existing people, under their then existing circumstances; but as ages rolled away, and the people were educated to higher spiritual capacity, the spiritual meaning of these directions was more and more set forth by the prophets; until at last, when the true Sacrifice for sin had come, the typical and preparatory character of these arrangements was fully declared. LANGE (Hom. in Lev. General) says "Leviticus appears to be the most peculiarly Old Testament in its character of all the Old Testament books, since Christ has entirely removed all outward sacrifices. It may certainly be rightly said that the law of sacrifice, or the ceremonial law has been abrogated by Christianity. But if the law in general, in its outward historical and literal form has been abrogated, on the other hand, in its spiritual sense, it has been fulfilled (Gal. ii.; Rom. iii.; Matt. v.); and so it must also be said in regard to the law of sacrifices. The sacrificial law in its idea has only been fully realized in Christianity;—in its principle fulfilled, realized, in Christ, to be realized from this as a basis, continually in the life of Christians." In the Epistle to the Hebrews the character of the sacrificial system in general, and particularly of that part of it contained in Leviticus, is clearly set forth as at once imperfect and transitory in itself, and yet typical of, and preparatory for, "the good things to come." A flood of light is indeed thrown back from the anti-type upon the type, and for this reason the Old Testament is always to be studied in connection with the New; yet on the other hand, the converse is also true, and Leviticus has still a most important purpose for the Christian Church in that it sets forth, albeit in type and shadow, the will of an unchangeable God in regard to all who would draw nigh to Him. Much of the New Testament, and especially of the Epistle to the Hebrews, can only be fully understood through a knowledge of Leviticus. To this general object of the book may be added the special purposes, already necessarily involved, of preserving the Israelites alike from idolatry by the multiform peculiarity of their ritual, and of saving them from indolence in their worship by the exacting character of the ceremonial. The Christian Fathers, as EUSEBIUS, SS. AUGUSTINE, LEO, CYRIL, as well as ORIGEN and many others, speak of the book as setting forth in types and shadows the sacrifice of Christ; while many of them also, as TERTULLIAN, SS. CLEMENT, JEROME, CHRYSOSTOM, and others, speak of the inferior purpose just mentioned.

Of the authorship of this book there is little need to speak, because there is really no room for doubt. This is not the place to combat the opinions of those critics who, like KALISCH, hold the whole Pentateuch to have been a very late compilation from fragments of various dates, and the Mosaic system to have been one of gradual human development. The portions assigned by KNOBEL to another author than the "Elohist" are x. 16-20; xvii.–xx.; xxiii., part of ver. 2 and ver. 3, vers. 18, 19, 22, 29-44; xxiv. 10-23; xxv. 18-22; and xxvi.; but the reasons given "are too transparently unsatisfactory to need serious discussion." Generally, it may be said that even those critics who question most earnestly the Mosaic authorship of some other portions of the Pentateuch are agreed that Leviticus must have proceeded substantially from Moses. There is really no scope in this book for the Jehovistic and Elohistic controversy; for although KNOBEL delights to point out the distinct portions by each writer, yet the name אֱלֹהִים never occurs in Lev. absolutely, but only with a possessive pronoun marking the Deity as peculiarly Israel's God. (It is however once used, xix. 4, for false gods). The book contains every possible mark of contemporaneous authorship, and there are constant indications of its having been written during the life in the wilderness. The words used for the sanctuary are either מִשְׁכָּן (4 times) or אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד (35 times) and never any term implying a more permanent structure. For the dwellings of the people, בַּיִת in the sense of a house, is never used except in reference to the future habitation of the promised land, which is the more striking because it occurs thirty-seven times in this sense, and in all of them with *express* reference to the future, except xxvii. 14, 15, where this reference is implied; זְבוּל, מָעוֹן, and נָוֶה do not occur at all; אֹהֶל *tent*, occurs once, while the

indefinite word מוֹשָׁב is found eight times; סֻכָּה, which is neither *house* nor *tent*, but *booth*, occurs four times in the commands connected with the observance of the feast of tabernacles, and with especial reference to Israel's having dwelt in booths at their first coming out from Egypt (xxiii. 43). The use of all these terms is thus exactly suited to the wilderness period, but not to any other. The use of הוּא for the feminine, so frequently changed in the Samaritan to הִיא, and so pointed by the Masorets; the use of עֵדָה for the people, so common in Ex., Lev., Num., and Josh., and so infrequent elsewhere; the usual designation of them as the *children of Israel*, a phrase so largely exchanged for the simple *Israel* in later writers; and many other marks point to the earliest period of Hebrew literature as the time of the composition of this book. The book itself repeatedly claims to record the laws which were given to Moses *in Mount Sinai*, or *in the wilderness of Sinai* (vii. 38; xxv. 1; xxvi. 46; xxvii. 34), and in one instance (xvi. 1), the time is sharply defined as after the death of Aaron's two sons, and sometimes (xxi. 24; xxiii. 44) the immediate publication of the laws is mentioned. There are frequent references to the time "When ye be come into the land of Canaan" as yet in the future (xiv. 34; xix. 23; xxiii. 10); and laws are given for use in the wilderness, as *e. g.*, the slaughter of all animals intended for food at the door of the tabernacle as sacrifices (xvii. 1-6), which would have been impossible to observe when the life in the camp was exchanged for that in the scattered cities of Canaan, and which was actually abrogated on the eve of the entrance into the promised land (Deut. xii. 15, 20-22). In this abrogation no mention is made of the previous law, but its existence is implied, and the change is based on the distance of their future homes. There is frequent reference in the laws to the "camp" (iv. 12, 21; vi. 11; xiii. 46; xiv. 3, 8; xvi. 26, 27, 28), so that in after times it became necessary to adopt as a rule of interpretation that this should always be understood in the law of the city in which the sanctuary stood. Throughout the book Aaron appears as the only high-priest (although this term is never used) and provision is repeatedly made for his son, who should be anointed, and should minister in his stead; and Aaron's sons appear as the only priests. The Levites have not yet been appointed, nor are they ever mentioned except in one passage in reference to their cities in the future promised land (xxv. 32, 33). Not to dwell further upon particulars, it may be said in a word that we have here, and here only, the full sacrificial and priestly system which is recognized as existing in the two following books of the Pentateuch, and all subsequent Hebrew literature. For an excellent summary of the evidence, see WARRINGTON'S "When was the Pentateuch written?" (London: *Christian Evidence Com. of Soc. P. C. K.*).

The only passage presenting any real difficulty in regard to the date of the book is xviii. 28, "That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you." For the true sense of these words, see the commentary; but even taking it as it stands in the A. V., and supposing the whole exhortation, vers. 24-30, to have been added by divine direction when Moses made his final revision of the work on the plains of Moab, we can easily understand the language. Already, the conquest of the trans-Jordanic region was accomplished, and that of the rest of the land was to be immediately entered upon with the clearest promise of success. God warns the people through Moses, when all shall be done, not to follow in the ways of the Canaanites, lest they also themselves suffer as their predecessors had suffered. It is simply a case of the Lord's speaking from the stand-point of an accomplished work, while the work was in progress, and assuredly soon to be completed. It is to be noted that in the book itself the claim to Mosaic authorship is distinctly made in the last verse of chap. xxvi., and again of the appendix, chap. xxvii. (comp. Num. xxxvi. 13).

§ 2. UNITY AND CONTENTS OF LEVITICUS.

The Book of Leviticus is marked on the surface with these elements of unity: it is all centred in the newly-erected tabernacle; and only a few weeks passed away between its beginning and its close. There is necessarily much variety in so considerable a collection of laws, and something of historical narrative in connection with the immediate application of those laws; but the main purpose is everywhere apparent and controlling—the arrangements

whereby a sinful people may approach, and remain in permanent communion with a holy God. This will better appear in the following table of contents. The arrangement of the book is as systematic as the nature of its contents allowed. In regard to one or two alleged instances of repetition (xi. 39, 40 compared with xxii. 8, and xix. 9 with xxiii. 22) it is sufficient to say that they were intentional (see the commentary); and in regard to several chapters supposed to be placed out of their natural connection, (as *e. g.*, chaps. xii. and xv.,) it simply does not appear that the thread of connection in the mind of Moses was the same as in that of the critic. In fact, in the instances alleged, the great Legislator seems to have taken especial pains to break that connection which is now spoken of as the natural one, and has thus, for important reasons, separated the purification after child-birth from all other purifications which might otherwise have seemed to be of the same character. Such points will be noticed in detail in the commentary. Nevertheless, it is to be remembered that Leviticus was given at Sinai in view of an immediate and direct march to Canaan, which should have culminated in the possession of the promised land. When this had been prevented in consequence of the sin of the people, a long time—above thirty-eight years—passed away before the encampment on the plains of Moab. During this period the law was largely in abeyance, as is shown by the fact that its most imperative requirement, circumcision, was entirely omitted to the close (Josh. v. 5-8). After this long interval, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the writings of Moses would have been revised before his death, and such clauses and exhortations added as the changed circumstances might require. These passages, however, if really written at that time, so far from being in any degree incongruous with the original work, do but fill out and emphasize its teachings.

The contents of Leviticus are arranged in the following table in such a way as to show something of the connection of its parts.

BOOK I.—Of approach to God. (Chaps. I.—XVI.).

FIRST PART. (i.—vii.) Laws of Sacrifice.

§ 1. General rules for the Sacrifices. (i.—vi. 7).

- **A.** Burnt offerings. i.
- **B.** Oblations (Meat offerings). ii.
- **C.** Peace offerings. iii.
- **D.** Sin offerings. iv.—v. 13.
- **E** Trespass offerings. v. 14—vi. 7.

§ 2. Special instructions chiefly for the Priests. vi. 8—vii. 38.

- **A.** For Burnt offerings. vi. 8–13.
- **B.** " Oblations (Meat offerings). vi. 14–23.
- **C.** " Sin offerings. vi. 24–30.
- **D.** " Trespass offerings. vii. 1–6.
- **E** " the Priests' portion of the above. vii. 7–10.
- **F.** " Peace offerings in their variety. vii. 11–21.
- **G.** " the Fat and the Blood. vii. 22–27.
- **H.** " the priests' portion of peace offerings. vii. 28–36.

Conclusion of this Section. vii. 37, 38.

SECOND PART. Historical. (viii.—x.).

§ 1. The Consecration of the Priests. viii.

§ 2. Entrance of Aaron and his sons on their office. ix.

§ 3. The sin and punishment of Nadab and Abihu. x.

THIRD PART. The Laws of Purity. (xi.—xv.).

§ 1. Laws of clean and unclean food. xi.

§ 2. Laws of purification after child-birth. xii.

§ 3. Laws concerning Leprosy. (xiii., xiv.).

A. Examination and its result. xiii. 1–46.

B. Leprosy in clothing and leather. xiii. 47–59.

C. Cleansing and restoration of a Leper. xiv. 1–32.

D. Leprosy in a house. xiv. 33–53.

E. Conclusion. xiv. 54–57.

§ 4. Sexual impurities and cleansings. xv.

FOURTH PART. The Day of Atonement. xvi.

BOOK II.—Of continuance in communion with God. (Chaps. XVII.—XXVI.).

FIRST PART. Holiness on the part of the people. (xvii.—xx.).

§ 1. Holiness in regard to Food. xvii.

§ 2. Holiness of the Marriage relation. xviii.

§ 3. Holiness of Conduct towards God and man. xix.

§ 4. Punishment for Unholiness. xx.

SECOND PART. Holiness on the part of the Priests, and holiness of the Offerings. xxi., xxii.

THIRD PART. Sanctification of Feasts. (xxiii.—xxv.).

§ 1. Of the Sabbaths and Annual Feasts. xxiii.

§ 2. Of the Holy lamps and Shew-bread. xxiv. 1–9.

§ 3. Historical. The punishment of a Blasphemer. xxiv. 10–23.

§ 4. Of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years. xxv.

FOURTH PART. Conclusion. Promises and Threats. xxvi.

Appendix. Of vows. xxxvii.

§ 3. THE RELATION OF THE LEVITICAL CODE TO HEATHEN USAGES.

Widely divergent views have been held by different writers upon this subject. SPENCER (*De legibus Hebræorum*) was disposed to find an Egyptian origin for almost every Mosaic institution. BAEHR (*Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*) has sought to disprove all connection between them. The *à priori* probability seems well expressed by MARSHAM (*in Can. chron. Ægypt.*, p. 154, ed. Leips.) as quoted by ROSENMUELLER (*Pref. in Lev.*, p. 5, note). "We know from Scripture that the Hebrews were for a long time inhabitants of Egypt; and we may suspect, not without reason, that they did not wholly cast off Egyptian usages, but rather that some traces of Egyptian habit remained. Many laws of Moses are from ancient customs. Whatever hindered the *cultus* of the true Deity, he strictly forbade. Moses abrogated most of the Egyptian rites, some he changed, some he held as indifferent, some he permitted, and even commanded." Yet this legislation by its many additions and omissions, and the general remoulding of all that remained became, as ROSENMUELLER also remarks, peculiarly and distinctively Hebrew, adapted to their needs, and sharply separating them from all other people.

It can scarcely be necessary to speak of what the Mosaic law taught in common with the customs of all people at this period of the world's history. The aim of the law was to elevate the Israelites to a higher and better standard, but gently, and as they were able to bear it. Certain essential laws were given, and these were insisted upon absolutely and with every varied form of command which could add to the emphasis. The unity of God, and His omnipotence, were taught with a distinctness which was fast fading out from the world's recollection, and which we scarcely find elsewhere at this period, except in the book of Job, which may itself have been modified in Mosaic hands. So, too, the necessity of outward sacramental observances for the whole people, whereby communion with God through His Church should be maintained, were strongly insisted upon, as in circumcision and the Passover, and other sacrifices. But when we come to consider the conduct of the ordinary life, we find the universally received customs of the times not abrogated, but only restrained and checked according to the capacity of the people. All these checks and restraints were in the direction of, and looking towards, the higher standard of the morality of the Gospel, as may be seen in the law of revenge, where unlimited vengeance was restricted to a return simply equal to the injury received; in the laws of marriage, which imposed many restrictions on the freedom of divorce and of polygamy; in the laws of slavery, which so greatly mitigated the hardships of that condition. But in these, as in many other matters, their Heavenly Father dealt tenderly with His people, and "for the hardness of their hearts" suffered many things which were yet contrary to His will.

The same general principles apply to the retention among them of very much of Egyptian custom and law. It is more important to speak of these because the Israelites lived so long and in such close contact with the Egyptians from the very time of their beginning to multiply into a nation until the eve of the promulgation of the Sinaitic legislation. Particular points in which this legislation was adapted to the already acquired habits and ideas of the people, will be noticed in the commentary as occasion requires. It is only necessary here to point out on the one hand how apparent *lacunæ* in the Mosaic teaching may thus be explained, and on the other, how largely the Egyptian *cultus* itself had already been modified, in all probability, by the influence of the fathers of the Jewish people. By consideration of the former it is seen, *e. g.*, why so little should have been said in the Mosaic writings of immortality and the future life. This doctrine was deeply engraven in the Egyptian mind, and interwoven as a fundamental principle with their whole theology and worship. It passed on to the Israelites as one of those elementary truths so universally received that it needed not to be dwelt upon. The latter is necessarily involved in more obscurity; but when we consider the terms on which Abraham was received by the monarch of Egypt; the position occupied at a later date by Jacob; the rank of Joseph, and his intermarriage with the high-priestly family; and remember at the same time that the priesthood of Egypt was still in possession of a higher and purer secret theology than was communicated to the people—we see how Israel could have accepted from the land of the Pharaohs an extent of customs, (to be purified, modified, and *toned* by their own Sinaitic legislation) which it might have been dangerous to receive from any other people. Yet plainly, whatever of detail may have been adopted from Egyptian sources, it was so connected and correlated in the Mosaic legislation that the whole spirit of the two systems became totally unlike.

§ 4. LITERATURE.

The ancient versions are of great value in the interpretation of the technical language of the law. The Samaritan text and version (which however sometimes betray a want of familiarity in detail with the ritual as practised at Jerusalem) often give valuable readings; so also the Septuagint, the Chaldee Targums, and of later date, the Syriac and the Vulgate.

The New Testament, especially the Epistle to the Hebrews, supplies to a large extent an inspired commentary upon Leviticus. The various treatises of Philo, and the antiquities of Josephus, give also fully the ancient explanations of many single passages and views of larger sections.

Since their time the literature of Leviticus is voluminous, consisting of commentaries,

of special treatises upon the subjects with which it is occupied, and of archæological investigations illustrating it. Of special treatises sufficient mention will be made in connection with the subjects to which they relate, and it is unnecessary here to particularize works of archæology. Of commentaries the following are those which have been chiefly used in the preparation of the present work: ORIGEN: *Selecta in Lev.* and *Hom. in Lev.* THEODORET, *Quæst. in Lev.* AUGUSTINE, *Quæst. in Lev.* BIBLIA MAX. VERSIONUM, containing the annotations of NICOLAS DE LYRA, TIRINUS, MENOCHIUS, and ESTIUS, Paris, 1660. CALVIN, *in Pentateuchum.* CRITICI SACRI, London, 1660. POLI, *Synopsis*, London, 1689. MICHAELIS, *Bibl. Hebr.*, Halle, 1720. CALMET, Wircesburgii, 1789. PATRICK, London, 1842, and freq. ROSENMUELLER, Leipsic, 1824. Of more recent date, KNOBEL (of especial value), Leipsic, 1858. BOOTHROYD, *Bibl. Hebr.*, Pontefract (no date). BARRETT'S *Synopsis of Criticisms.* London, 1847. KALISCH, *Leviticus*, London, 1872. OTTO VON GERLACH on the *Pentateuch*, translated by DOWNING, London, 1860. WORDSWORTH, London, 1865. KEIL and DELITZSCH on the *Pentateuch;* (KEIL), translated by MARTIN, Edinburgh, 1866. MURPHY on *Leviticus*, Am. Ed., Andover, 1872. CLARK, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, New York, 1872. GIRDLESTONE, *Synonyms of the Old Testament*, London, 1871. To which must be added, as containing much of commentary on large portions of this book, BAEHR, *Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus*, Heidelberg, 1837–'39, *2te Auflage*, Erster Band, Heidelberg, 1874. OUTRAM on *Sacrifices*, translated by ALLEN, London, 1817. HENGSTENBERG, *Die Opfer des heil. Schrift*, Berlin, 1839. KURTZ on *Sacrifice*, Mitau, 1864. HERMANN SCHULTZ, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, Frankfurt a M., 1869, 2 vols. ŒHLER, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1873–74 (a translation is in the press of T. & T. Clark). Of LANGE'S own commentary (1874) as much as possible, and it is believed everything of importance, has been introduced into this work, which was already well advanced before its publication. Such portions are always distinctly marked. In several of the chapters his commentary is given in full; in others, nearly so.

PRELIMINARY NOTE ON THE LEVITICAL SACRIFICES.

Leviticus properly opens with the law of sacrifice, because this was the centre and basis of the Divine service in the newly-erected tabernacle. But since sacrifices have to do with the relations of man to God, they can only satisfactorily be considered in connection with the established facts of those relations. Of these facts three are fundamental: the original condition of man in a state of holiness and of communion with God; the fall, by which he became sinful, and thus alienated from God; and the promise, given at the very moment of man's passing from the one state to the other. The promise was that in the future the woman's Seed should bruise the serpent's head—that in the long struggle between man and the power of evil, one born of woman should obtain the final victory. This promise was ever cherished by the devout in all the following ages as the anchor of their hope, and its realization, as seen at the birth of Cain and of Noah, was continually looked for. The expectation of a Deliverer, Redeemer, Messiah, became the common heritage of humanity, although as time rolled away, it tended to become faint and obscure. Therefore there came the call in Abraham of a peculiar people, in whom this hope should not only be kept alive, but, as far as possible, saved from distortion and misconception. It was distinctly the blessing of Abraham's call, the birthright renewed to his son and grandson, and the reason for the choice and the care of a peculiar people.

From the circumstances under which this promise was given, and the way in which it is constantly treated in Revelation, it is plain that the restoration of man to full communion with God could only be brought about by the restoration of man's holiness; it was only in obedience to the Divine will that man could obtain at-one-ment with his Maker. This might seem to be sufficiently plain as a truth of natural religion, but it was also abundantly taught in history and in Scripture. Not only was it shown by the great judgments upon transgression in the deluge, in Babel, in the overthrow of Sodom, *etc.*, but constantly the relative and partial attainment of holiness, as in the case of Enoch, Noah, and others, was made the ground of a relatively larger bestowal of the Divine favor. Abraham's acceptance was expressly grounded upon his faith—necessarily including those works without which faith is dead—and so with the other heroes recounted in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews. Later, Moses in his parting exhortations in Deuteronomy, constantly and strongly urges the necessity of a loving obedience springing from the heart, and this is more and more fully unfolded by the prophets from Samuel down, as the people were able to bear it.

Meantime from the first, in the case of Cain and Abel, and probably still earlier, and then among all nations as they arose, sacrifices were resorted to as a means of approach to God. From their universality, it is plain that they were looked upon as in some way helping to bring about that restoration of communion with God which should have been reached by a perfect holiness; but since man was conscious he did not possess this holiness, sacrifices were resorted to. As they never could have been offered by a sinless being, they necessarily involve confession of sin. Whether sacrifice in its origin was a Divine institution, or whether it sprang from a human consciousness of its propriety, is here immaterial. LANGE takes the latter view. It speedily received the Divine sanction and command. Theoretically the sacrifice could have had no intrinsic value for the forgiveness of sin. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 13; x. 4) has abundantly shown that while sacrifices might have in themselves a certain absolute value for purposes of ceremonial purification, there was yet no

congruity or correlation between the blood of bulls and goats and the removal of human sin. Hence, theoretically also, sacrifices, while they received the Divine approbation, must have been a temporary institution, in some way useful to man for the time being, but looking forward to the true atonement by the victory of the woman's Seed over evil. Thus sacrifices are in their very nature typical; having little force in themselves, and yet appointed for the accomplishment of a result which can only be truly attained in the fulfilment of the primeval promise. How far this true nature of sacrifices may have been more or less dimly perceived by man from the outset, it is not necessary here to inquire. It is obvious that from this point of view the intrinsic value of the sacrifices was entirely a secondary matter; their whole efficacy resulted from the Divine appointment or approbation of them.

The tendency of man apart from Revelation to corruption in his ideas of God and of the means of approaching Him is nowhere more marked than in regard to sacrifice. The gods of the heathen were, for the most part, deifications of nature or her powers; they represented natural forces, and instead of originating are themselves governed by natural laws. This is true, whether their creed were polytheistic, as that of the Greeks and Romans, or pantheistic, as that of Buddhism. In Hebrew law, on the other hand, God appears "as the Creator and omnipotent Ruler of the universe, a personal Lord of an impersonal world, totally distinct from it in essence, and absolutely swaying it according to His will; but also the merciful Father of mankind." "Therefore the sacrifices of the Hebrews have a *moral* or *ethical*, those of other nations a purely *cosmical* or *physical* character; the former tend to work upon mind and soul, the latter upon fears and interests; the one strives to elevate the offerer to the sanctity of God, the other to lower the gods to the narrowness and selfishness of man." KALISCH. Moreover, among the heathen, God was regarded as alienated, and to be propitiated in such ways as man could devise; sacrifices were considered as having a certain satisfying power in themselves, as in some sort a *quid pro quo*, and as an *opus operatum*, independent of the moral life of the offerer. Hence as the occasion rose in importance, the value of the sacrifice was increased even to the extent of sometimes using human victims. Among the Israelites, sacrifices were known to be of God's own appointment as a means of approach to Him. They had a shadow, indeed, of the heathen character, as offering actual compensations for certain offences against the theocratic state, but this was very secondary. Their main object was to bridge over the gulf between sinful man and a holy God. Although the *law* of sacrifices necessarily stands by itself, yet the same Legislator everywhere insists upon the necessity of a loving obedience to God. Hence, however costly sacrifices might be allowed, and even encouraged as Free-will, and Peace, and Thank-offerings, and more numerous victims were required at the festivals and on other occasions for burnt-offerings, the Sin-offering must (except in certain specially defined cases) be of the commonest and cheapest of the domestic animals, and even this always, as nearly as might be, of a uniform value. There was no gradation in the value of the offering in proportion to the heinousness of the offence; the atonement for all sins, whatever the degree of their gravity, was the same. Even the morning and evening sacrifice for the whole people which, although not strictly a sin-offering, yet had a somewhat propitiatory character, was still the single lamb. By this the typical nature of sacrifice as a temporary and, in itself, ineffectual means, was strongly expressed.

That the ancients had the idea of sin as a moral offence against God, has indeed been called in question; but seems too certain, at least among the Egyptians, the Hindoos, and the Israelites, to require proof. It is abundantly expressed in the book of Job. It may be well, however, to point out some of the heads of the evidence that sacrifice was regarded as a propitiation for such sin, *i. e.*, as a means for obtaining the Divine pardon for its guilt. Prominent in this evidence is the fact just mentioned, that there was no proportion between the offence and the value of the sacrifice; since the idea of *compensation* was thus excluded, it remains that what was sought for was *forgiveness*. CALVIN (in Lev. i.) justly remarks that the idea of reconciliation with God was connected under the old dispensation with sacrifice after a sacramental fashion, as with baptism now. Historically, this idea of sacrifice as a means of obtaining forgiveness is clearly brought out in the sacrifices of Job, both for his children in the time of his prosperity (Job i. 5), and for his friends after his affliction (xlii.

8). THOLUCK, following SCHOLL, has shown (Diss. II., App. Ep. Hebr.) that the idea of such propitiation was prevalent throughout all antiquity; that clean animals were changed in their *status* on the express ground of their being "a sin-offering," "an atonement," so that the parts of them not consumed upon the altar might be eaten only by the priests, and their remains must be burned, or else the whole burned, without the camp (Ex. xxix. 14; Lev. iv. 11, 12, 21; vi. 30; xvi. 27, 28, *etc.*); that the idea is distinctly brought out in Lev. xvii. 11, and in parallel passages. "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls;" that in the case of a murder by unknown hands (Deut. xxi. 9) the guilt of the crime must rest upon the whole neighborhood until the people had symbolically transferred that guilt to a victim, and this had been offered in sacrifice; and finally, that the ritual of the day of atonement necessarily involves this idea. (See on chap. xvi.) "The notion of internal atonement . . . . formed a distinctive feature of the theology of the Pentateuch." KALISCH, I. p. 161.

On passing from these more general considerations to the particular system of the Levitical sacrifices, it needs to be constantly borne in mind that these, far from being a new institution, were in fact a special arrangement and systematizing of one of the most ancient institutions known to man. The change from the one to the other was strictly parallel to the course of divine operations in nature. The earlier is ever the more general and comprehensive; the later the more specialized both in structure and functions. At the same time the law was not merely an evolution, a normal development of Divine teaching previously received, but it was distinctly "added because of transgressions until the promised seed should come." We must therefore be prepared to find in it especial safeguards for the chosen people against those misconceptions which became common among the heathen, and also a constant relation to its final cause and its *terminus* when "the Seed should come."

It will help materially to a clear idea of the Mosaic sacrificial system if we examine the various words used for sacrifice before and under the law, having regard also to the subsequent usage of the same words and to their various translations in the ancient versions.

The earliest word that occurs is also the most general in its original sense, though under the law it acquires a strictly technical signification: מִנְחָה, given by the lexicographers as from a root not used, מָנַח=מָנָה=*to distribute, to deliver*, and hence *to make a present of, to give*. In the LXX. it is translated before the law only by the words δῶρον (Gen. iv. 4; xxxii. 13, 18, 20, 21, *etc.*) and θυσία (Gen. iv. 3, 5 only); in the law, where it occurs very frequently, only by θυσία or by the combination δῶρον θυσία, and this is the case also in Ezekiel (although twice, Lev. ii. 13; Num. xviii. 9, the form is θυσίασμα), except in the single instance of σεμίδαλις, Lev. ix. 4. After the books of the law both these translations are frequently employed, and also προσφορά once (Ps. xxxix. 9), ξένιον three times, and frequently the Hebrew word is simply expressed in Greek letters μαναά. The Vulg. translates by *munus, munusculum, oblatio, oblatio sacrificii,* and *sacrificium;* but in the law *oblatio* and *sacrificium* are the terms commonly employed. In the A. V. *meat-offering,* or simply *offering,* is the only translation in Ex., Lev., Num. and Ezek.; but *present, gift, sacrifice* and *oblation* are used elsewhere as well as these, usually according to the sense implied by the context. The word is used outside of the law in the general sense of a propitiatory gift or tribute to any one, and hence of such a gift to God, or sacrifice in its most general sense. It is used of the offerings of both Cain and Abel, the one unbloody, the other bloody. In the prophets it is used as a word for sacrifice in general. It is used frequently in the historical books of gifts or tribute from man to man as from Jacob to Esau, to Joseph in Egypt, of the Moabites and Syrians to David, and distinctly of tribute, 2 Kings xvii. 3, 4, *etc.* In the law (Ex., Lev., Num., to which must be added Ezek.) it has a strictly defined technical signification, and is applied only to the oblation (A. V. meat-offering) except in Num. v., where it is used (six times) of the unbloody jealousy-offering of barley. It is always therefore in the law a bloodless offering, and being nearly always an accompaniment of a bloody offering, may be regarded in its original sense of a gift to God, offered along with a sacrifice more strictly so called. In the few instances in which it stands alone it never appears as offered for the purpose of atonement. In the case of the sin-offering of flour allowed in extreme poverty (Lev.

v. 11–13) this is expressly distinguished from the מִנְחָה in that the remainder should belong to the priest, כַּמִּנְחָה.

The word which comes next in the order of the record is עֹלָה, derived from עָלָה, *to ascend, to glow, to burn.* It means uniformly throughout the Old Testament: *the whole burnt-sacrifice,* so specifically indeed that twice (Deut. xxxiii. 10; Ps. li. 19 [21]) כָּלִיל= *whole* is substituted for it. In a few cases it is variously translated by the LXX. (once each *ἀδικία, ἀνάβασις, ἀναφορά,* six times *θυσία,* thirteen times *κάρπωμα,* three times *κάρπωσις*), but in the vast majority of cases by some term signifying the holocaust, *ὁλοκάρπωμα* (three times), *ὁλοκάρπωσις* (eleven times), *ὁλοκαύτωμα* (most frequently), *ὁλοκαύτωσις* (seventy-three times). In the Vulg. the only renderings are *holocaustum* (seldom *holocautoma*) and *hostia,* except a very few times *oblatio;* in the A. V., always either *burnt-offering* or *burnt-sacrifice,* which are used interchangeably, and seem to have been intended to convey the same meaning. It is first used in Gen. viii. 20 for the sacrifices offered by Noah, and throughout Gen. xxii. It is also used three times in Exodus (x. 25; xviii. 12; xxiv. 5) in relation to sacrifices previous to those of the Levitical system. In the law itself it occurs very frequently, and also in the subsequent books. It constitutes the daily morning and evening sacrifice for the congregation. It was always an animal sacrifice and was wholly consumed, except the skin, upon the altar. In signification it was the most general of all the sacrifices, and in fact was the only unspecialized bloody sacrifice of the law. It must be regarded therefore as including within itself, more or less distinctly, the idea of all other sacrifices; it was a means of approach to God in every way in which that approach could be expressed. It was not distinctly a sin-offering; yet the fact that it should be accepted for the offerer "to make atonement for him" (לְכַפֵּר, Lev. i. 4) is prominent in its ritual, and the same idea is distinctly brought out in the (probably earlier) sacrifices of Job (Job i. 5; xlii. 8). There is a rabbinical maxim: "the burnt-offering expiates the transgressions of Israel," and this idea is fully expressed in the Targums. "The burnt-offering, as it is the most ancient, so also is it the most general and important in the Mosaic *cultus, ἀριστη δ'ἐστιν ἡ ὁλόκαυτος* (Philo de vict., p. 838)." THOLUCK (Diss. II. in Hebr.). Yet THOLUCK afterwards separates this sacrifice quite too absolutely from the sin-offering. The latter indeed, as specializing one feature of the burnt-offering, had a different ritual, and was without the oblation; as offered only for the expiation of sin, it carried with it to those who bore its unconsumed flesh a defilement which could not attach to the burnt-offering, since this included other ideas also within itself. But all this by no means forbids that in its general, comprehensive character, the burnt-offering should include the idea of expiation for sin which is distinctly attached to it in the law. It was often offered also as a praise or thank-offering (2 Sam. vi. 17, *etc.*). As already said, it was the one comprehensive sacrifice daily offered upon the altar of the tabernacle (Ex. xxix. 38–42); it was doubled on the Sabbath (Num. xxviii. 9, 10), and multiplied, with added victims of higher value, on the first of each month (*ib.* 11); and so also at the great yearly festivals (*ib.* 16–xxix. 39). So far as the burnt-offering had a specific signification of its own, its meaning is generally assumed by theologians to have been that of entire consecration to God. Such a meaning is certainly sufficiently appropriate; but is never distinctly attributed to it in the Scriptures either of the Old or New Testament. It is however constantly described in the more general sense of a means of approach to God.

זֶבַח is used not so much for any particular kind of sacrifice as for the victim for any sacrifice. It is frequently coupled with some other word determining the kind of sacrifice intended, especially זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים. When not so identified, it may mean any kind of sacrifice (although most frequently used of the peace-offerings), and does not therefore require particular consideration. It occurs first in Gen. xxxi. 54 and xlvi. 1, and is generally rendered in the LXX. and Vulg. *θύσια* and *hostia.* The verb is the technical word for slaughtering animals in sacrifice, nor is it ever used in any other sense in the Pentateuch except in Deut. xii. 15, 21, where permission is given to those at a distance from the sanctuary to slay sacrificial animals simply for food. In the later books there are very few other exceptions to this usage: 1 Sam. xxviii. 24; 2 Chron. xviii. 2; Ezek. xxxiv. 3. From this word is derived

the Hebrew name for the altar, מִזְבֵּחַ, not, as sometimes asserted, because sacrifices were originally slain upon the altar; but because this was the place of destination for them.

No other words for sacrifice occur until the time of the Exodus. There the various specialized forms of the Mosaic sacrifices are described; but before speaking of these the word עֲשָׂה must be mentioned, which is frequently rendered (chiefly in Lev. and Num.) *offer* or *sacrifice*. It is not, however, properly a sacrificial term; but merely a word of very broad signification—like *ποίεω* or *do*—which is adapted in sense to its connection. It first occurs in the meaning *sacrifice* in Ex. xxix. 36. Therefore passing by this, the earliest especial sacrificial term of the law is פֶּסַח, *πάσχα*, *pascha*, passover. It occurs first in Ex. xii. 11, and frequently afterwards, although only once in Lev. (xxiii. 5). The noun always means the lamb slain by the head of each house in Israel on the 14th Nisan, and eaten by him and his family the following evening, or at least the seven days' feast of which this was the beginning, and the characteristic feature. The history of its institution is fully given in Ex. xii. From the abundant references to it in the New Testament it was plainly designed as an especial type of Christ. It was distinctly a sacrifice, being reckoned a קָרְבָּן in Num. ix. 7, 13, and slain in the place of sacrifice (Deut. xvi. 5, 6), and its blood, after the first institution, was sprinkled by the priests (2 Chron. xxx. 16; xxxv. 11), as affirmed by all Jewish authorities; indeed, it is in connection with the Passover that the mention of the treatment of the blood of sacrifice first occurs. It is classed by Outram among the Eucharistic sacrifices, and is assimilated to them by the fact that its flesh was eaten by the offerer and his household; but is distinguished from them in having nothing of it given to the priest. It was really a sacrifice appointed before the institution of the priesthood in which each head of the family offered, and thus it perpetuated the remembrance that, by their calling, the whole nation were a holy people, chosen "to draw near to God." Its historic relations are always most prominent, and it was in fact the great sacrament of the covenant by which God had delivered Israel and constituted them His chosen people. Its celebration constituted the chief of the three great annual festivals, and was the only one of them having a fundamentally sacrificial character. It thus became a fit type of the new covenant and of the deliverance through Christ from the bondage of sin.

The שֶׁלֶם (from שָׁלַם) or peace-offering, is first mentioned Ex. xx. 24, in reference to the future offerings of the law, but in a way that seems to imply a previous familiarity with this kind of sacrifice. It is rendered in the LXX. sometimes by *εἰρηνικός*, but more generally by *σωτήριον*, and in the Vulg. by *pacificus* and *salutare;* in the A. V. uniformly *peace-offering*. Under the law it was separated into three varieties: the thank, the vow, and the free-will offering. See under vii. 12. In Lev. vii. 12, 13, 15; xxii. 29, the thank-offering has the distinct name, תּוֹדָה, which does not elsewhere occur in the law, though frequent afterwards. This variety included all the prescribed thank-offerings. The idea of propitiation was less prominent in this than in any other sacrifice, although the sprinkling of the blood—which was always propitiatory—formed a part of its ritual; but it was especially the sacrifice of communion with God, in which the blood was sprinkled and the fat burned upon the altar, certain portions given to the priests, and the rest consumed by the offerer with his family and friends in a holy sacrificial meal. In the wilderness no sacrificial animal might be used for food except it had first been offered as a sacrifice. It naturally became one of the most common of all the sacrifices, and the victims for it were sometimes provided in enormous numbers, as at Solomon's dedication of the temple (1 Kings viii. 63). Peace-offerings were, for the most part, voluntary, but were also prescribed on several occasions, as at the fulfillment of the Nazarite vow (Num. vi. 17), and are constantly expected at the great festivals. "The peace-offering was always preceded by the piacular victim, whenever any person offered both these kinds of sacrifices on the same day. Ex. xxix. 14, 22; Num. vi. 14, 16, 17." Outram. Although the שֶׁלֶם is not mentioned under its distinctive name before Ex. xx. 24, yet it cannot be doubted that sacrifices of the same character are included in the more general term, זֶבַח, at a much earlier period (see Gen. xxxi. 54; Ex. x. 25; xviii. 12), as they were certainly common at all times among the heathen. In the New Testament they are alluded to in Phil. iv. 18 and Heb. xiii. 15, 16.

חַטָּאת (from the Pihel of חָטָא) in the sense of *sin* occurs in Gen. iv. 7 and frequently; but in the sense of *sin-offering* is not found before the establishment of the Levitical system. The first instance of this sense is in Ex. xxix. 14, after which it is very frequent both in the law and in the later books. Besides a variety of occasional translations, the usual rendering in the LXX. is *ἁμαρτία*, and in the Vulg. *peccatum*. In the A. V. it is variously translated *punishment, punishment of sin, purification for sin, purifying, sinner, sin and sin-offering;* but the last two are by far the most common. It is the distinctive, technical word in the law for the piacular offering for sin. For its ritual see iv.—v. 13. The sin-offerings of which the blood was carried within the sanctuary, and whose bodies were burned without the camp, are particularly referred to in the New Testament as typical of Christ; but more general references to Him as our Sin-offering are frequent. Sin-offerings were prescribed (*a*) at each new moon, Num. xxviii. 15; (*b*) at each of the three great festivals, Num. xxviii. 22, 30; xxix. 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38; (*c*) at the feast of trumpets on the first day of the seventh month, and on the tenth day of the same, *ib.* 5, 11; (*d*) the sin-offering, *κατ' ἐξοχήν* on the great day of atonement, ch. xvi.; (*e*) private sin-offerings, for a woman after child-birth, xii. 6, 8; for the leper at his cleansing, xiv. 19, 22, 31; for a person cleansed of an issue, xv. 15, 30; for the Nazarite accidentally defiled, Num. vi. 11, and at the time of the fulfillment of his vow, *ib.* 14, 16; and on other special occasions, Num. vii. 16, 22, 28, 34, 40, *etc.;* besides the ordinary sin-offerings of Lev. iv. The ordinary victim was a she-goat or a ewe, replaced for the high-priest or for the whole congregation by a bullock, and for a prince by a he-goat for reasons given in the commentary on Lev. iv. In case of poverty, for the ordinary offering might be substituted turtle-doves or young pigeons, or even an offering of flour. But besides regular victims, there were various others prescribed for those exceptional occasions which from their nature required some such discrimination. Thus at Aaron's entrance upon his sacred functions his sin-offering was a calf (Lev. ix. 1–8); at the end of the Nazarite's vow (Num. vi. 14), and at the recovery of a leper able to bring this offering (Lev. xiv. 10, 19), a ewe-lamb was the prescribed victim. Though not strictly sin-offerings, yet to the same general category belong the red heifer whose ashes were used for purifications (Num. xix. 2–22), and the heifer to be slain in case of an unknown murder (Deut. xxi. 1–9). Yet these were all peculiar and exceptional cases, and the rule remains that the ordinary sin-offering was always the same.

קָרְבָּן is first used Lev. i. 2, occurs very frequently in Leviticus and Numbers, and is never used elsewhere except twice in Ezekiel. (With the pointing, קָרְבָּן, it is also found twice in Neh.) There are but one or two variations from the translation, *δῶρον*, in the LXX., and *donum* in the Vulg. In the A. V. it is generally translated *offering*, but sometimes *oblation*, and once (Lev. xxvii. 11) *sacrifice*. Its meaning is perfectly clear—that which is offered (brought nigh) to God, whether as a sacrifice or as a dedicatory gift; if, however, the thing offered be a sacrificial animal, then of course it necessarily means a sacrifice. In either case, it is something given to God.

אָשָׁם, like the nearly related חַטָּאת, has the double sense of *trespass* or *guilt* and *trespass-offering*. It occurs once in Genesis (xxvi. 10) in the former sense, but is not found in the latter earlier than Lev. v. 6. It is frequent in Leviticus, and less so in subsequent books in both senses. In the LXX. and Vulg. it has a considerable variety of renderings; but the most frequent are LXX. *πλημμέλεια*, and Vulg. *delictum*. For the distinction between this and the sin-offering, see iv. 1 and v. 14.

There remains, as belonging to the list of the sacrifices, the incense, for which two words are used, neither of which occur before the giving of the law. לְבוֹנָה first occurs Ex. xxx. 34, and is uniformly translated in the LXX. *λίβανος* (once, however, *λιβανωτός*), and in the Vulg. *thus;* it is always *frankincense* in the A. V. except in Isa. and Jer. where it is always *incense*. It is "a costly, sweet-smelling, pale-yellow resin, the milky exudation of a shrub" (Fuerst). קְטֹרֶת, which first occurs Ex. xxv. 6, on the other hand, is an incense compounded of frankincense and various sweet spices (Ex. xxx. 34). It is usually translated in the LXX. and Vulg. *θυμίαμα, thymiama*, but sometimes *σύνθεσις, compositio*. In the A. V. it is rendered either *incense*, or *sweet incense*, or a few times *perfume*. This incense was to be

burnt only within the sanctuary, twice daily on the golden altar (Ex. xxx. 7, 8), and also by the high-priest in the holy of holies on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 12, 13). The frankincense was offered by the people as a part of their oblations, and was mostly burnt in the court. The burning of all incense was a strictly priestly act, and is constantly spoken of in the Scriptures as symbolical of prayer (*e. g.* Rev. v. 8; viii. 3, 4). Pre-eminently does it typify the intercession of the true High Priest in heaven itself.

The word אִשֶּׁה=*offerings made by fire*, is not so much the name of a sacrifice as a description of all sacrifices burned upon the altar. It is applied to various kinds of sacrifices, Lev. i. 9; ii. 3; iii. 5, *etc.* נֶסֶךְ=*drink-offering* is first used Gen. xxxv. 14, and is not properly a sacrifice itself, but an accompaniment of other sacrifices. תְּנוּפָה=wave-offering, and תְּרוּמָה=heave-offering, refer to particular modes of presentation of certain offerings.

The animals used for victims were either "of the flock or of the herd," or in case of poverty, doves or pigeons. These were all clean animals, and were consequently among those commonly used for food; the quadrupeds were from domestic animals, and the birds those most easy of capture. (Domestic fowls are said not to have been known before the time of Solomon.) The ease and certainty of procuring these various victims seems a more likely reason for their selection than either their tameness—which certainly does not apply to the bull—or their value as property, since the cost of procuring wild animals would usually have been far greater. The idea that these animals were especially appointed for sacrificial victims because they were held sacred among heathen nations, and particularly among the Egyptians, although often advanced, is unsatisfactory for two reasons: first, because on this ground there is no reason why the number of sacrificial animals should not have been greatly enlarged; secondly, because these very animals, for the most part, were used in sacrifice by the nations that also worshipped them. Whatever typical significance they may have had, this can hardly be considered as the reason for their selection, since in the typical language of the prophets various other animals (*e. g.* the lion and the eagle) are so largely used. In fact the *lamb* seems to be the only one of the sacrificial animals typically employed in prophecy, the dove being only an alternative victim for the poor.

The public animal-sacrifices of the Israelites may be broadly separated into three great classes, according to the prominent purpose of each. I. The Burnt-offerings, or offerings of approach to God. The main idea of these, in so far as they had any especially distinctive idea, is generally considered to have been consecration to God's service as the necessary condition of approaching Him, and yet also including in a subordinate way the idea of expiation, without which sinful men might not draw near to God at all. This idea is represented outwardly and once for all in the Christian Church by baptism, and in its continual repetition by the various acts of worship and efforts to conform the life to Christ's example. With the burnt-offering belonged the unbloody, eucharistic oblation, together with its incense symbolizing prayer. II. The sin-offering, in its various forms, expressly provided for the purpose of atonement. Having no inherent efficacy, this yet clearly pointed forward to the only effectual atonement made by Christ Himself upon the cross. This sacrifice, as is most clearly shown in Hebrews, being efficacious for the forgiveness of all sin, can never be repeated; yet according to Christ's own command, we are to show forth His death until He come again in the Lord's supper, and thus historically the great sacrament of the Christian Church points back to that which the Levitical system prefigured. The central point of both dispensations is the same, but in the one case prophetic, in the other historic. III. The Peace-offerings were the ordinary means of communion with God through an external rite, and of expressing outwardly thanksgiving for His mercies, or supplication for His favors. They are to be considered not so much as typical definitely of any one thing in the new dispensation, but rather as meeting under the old a need which is now otherwise supplied; yet still in common with all sacrifices, they serve to set forth in shadow Him "who is our peace," and on whom feeding by faith we now have peace with God.

Besides these great classes of sacrifices, there were a multitude of others, mostly for individuals, some of which are distinctly included under one or the other of these classes, while others share the character of more than one of them, and others, like the Passover, have a

character peculiar to themselves. These will be treated in their appropriate places. There is one of them which must be mentioned on account of its great importance—the red heifer —but its treatment belongs in the following book, Num. xix. 1–10. In general it may be said, that as God's works will not conform very precisely to any human classification, since each creature is an individual entity to the Infinite, but always there will be characteristics in one group allying the genera in which it is found to some other widely se parated group so also in the works of the Divine word, we can only classify broadly and having regard to the most salient features, while, in view of less important characteristics, we might often be compelled to change the best classification that can be formed.

The vegetable sacrifices, or oblations, were correspondingly varied. These were usually accompaniments of the animal-offerings, but sometimes were independent. This was the case not only with the alternative sin-offering (Lev. v. 11), and the jealousy-offering (Num. v. 15), but also with the shew-bread, the Passover sheaf of barley and the Pentecostal wheaten loaves. Incense also was at times an independent offering. Drink-offerings appear exclusively as accompaniments of the animal sacrifices, and were of wine; but their ritual is nowhere prescribed.

The mineral kingdom was represented in the sacrifices only by the salt with which all other offerings were to be salted.

The ritual of the various sacrifices will be treated as they occur in the text. Suffice it here to say that three essential points are to be observed in all: First, that the victim should be solemnly offered to God. This, as Outram clearly shows (I. xv. 4), was accomplished by presenting the living victim or the oblation before the altar, and was the act of the offerer. Second, that the offerer should lay his hand upon the head of the victim thereby personally identifying himself with what he did. The exceptions to this are in the case of birds, for obvious reasons, and in the case of the Paschal lamb, instituted before the Levitical system, and when this act was unnecessary as the offerer acted himself in some sort as priest. Third, the intervention of a priest, as the mediator between God and man, who must sprinkle the blood and burn the parts required upon the altar; and in the case of the ordinary sin-offering as well as of many of the oblations, he must himself, as the representative of God, consume the remainder.

It appears from constant Rabbinical tradition, as well as from the probability of the case, that prayer or confession on the part of the offerer always accompanied the sacrifice. Indeed, this is often spoken of in particular cases in Scripture itself, and language is there used in regard to the sacrifices which implies the universality of the custom. When the patriarchs built altars, they "called upon the name of the Lord" (Gen. xii. 8, *etc.*). Confession is required in connection with the sin and trespass-offerings (Lev. v. 5; Num. v. 7), and especially with the great propitiation on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi. 21). A form of prayer is prescribed for the oblation of the first fruits (Deut. xxvi. 3–10), and of the tithes (*ib.* 13–15). Sacrificing and calling upon God are often used as equivalent terms (1 Sam. xiii. 12; Prov. xv. 8, *etc.*), and the temple is indifferently called "the house of sacrifice" (2 Chron. vii. 12, *etc.*), and "the house of prayer" (Isa. lvi. 7, *etc.*), and frequently prayer and confession are mentioned in connection with sacrifice on particular occasions, or in a general way as showing that the one accompanied the other as a matter of course (1 Sam. vii. 9; Job xlii. 8; Ezra vi. 10; 1 Chron. xxi. 26; xxix. 10–21; 2 Chron. xxx. 22; Ps. lxvi. 13–20; cxvi. 13, 17, *etc.*). For further details of the ritual, and especially for the Rabbinical traditions on the subject, the reader is referred to Outram, Kalisch, and other special treatises on sacrifice.

Of the purpose and design of the whole sacrificial cultus, but little need be added to what has already been said. That in a theocratic state the expiatory offerings had, as an incidental object, the compensation for minor offences against that state, and the doing away with ceremonial hindrances to worship is undeniable; but that they had also a farther and higher object is plain both from the study of the Mosaic legislation itself and from their treatment throughout the New Testament, especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Besides their typical value, they had a powerful educational use. "As we survey the expiatory offerings of the Hebrews, which for purity stand unrivalled in the ancient world, we are

bound to admit that they were pre-eminently calculated to keep alive among the nation those feelings on which all religious life depends, and from which it flows as its natural source, the feelings of human sinfulness and the conviction of the divine holiness, by the standard of which that sinfulness is to be measured; they fostered, therefore, at once humility and an ideal yearning; and they effectually counteracted that sense of self-righteousness natural indeed to the pride of man, but utterly destructive of all noble virtues. They were well suited to secure in the directest and completest manner that singleness of life and heart which is the true end of all sacrifices. * * * Though bearing the character of vicariousness, the sin-offerings were far from encouraging an external worship by lifeless ceremonies; in themselves the spontaneous offspring of religious repentance, and thus naturally helping to nourish the same beneficent feeling, they were the strongest guarantee for a life of honesty and active virtue." KALISCH I., p. 187 sq.

It is, however, to be remembered that while sacrifices were abundantly provided for him who sinned inadvertently, on the other hand no sacrifice was allowed for him who sinned "presumptuously" (Num. xv. 30, 31; Deut. xvii. 12), that is, with deliberate and high-handed purpose; for the offender thus declared that he did not desire to be at one with God; there was in him no internal disposition to correspond with the outward act of sacrifice. Certainly nothing could show more clearly that the efficacy of sacrifice is connected with the disposition of the heart. It was natural that many of the fathers, in the strong re-action of early Christianity from Judaism, should have thought the Jewish sacrifices were "instituted because the people, having been long accustomed to such modes of worship in Egypt, could scarcely have been confined to the worship of the one true God without the indulgence and introduction into their religion of those rites to which they had been long habituated and were exceedingly attached" (Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, as referred to by OUTRAM). Nevertheless, they saw in them distinctly a typical reference to Christ, and ORIGEN is elsewhere quoted as showing that this belonged to all the sacrifices because they all ceased with His sacrifice.

LANGE (*Dogmatik in Lev.*), after showing the connection between this and the preceding book, continues: "Leviticus then is right in treating first of the sacrifice. Nothing is clearer than that the sacrifice is not herein a new, positive, Divine command, but is a ground-form, true of natural religion, which as such depends originally on a spiritual impulse. It is said of Cain and Abel, that they offered sacrifice, but not that sacrifice was commanded them. Noah in the same way sacrificed from free inclination." [Is not something more implied in the command to take into the ark of the clean animals by sevens?] "It seems significant that only after the performance of the sacrifice is the divine satisfaction mentioned. Thus the theocratic sacrifice is the consecration of the natural sacrifice existing before. * * * This then is the meaning of the symbolic sacrifice; it is the expression of the fact that the offerer, in his sin and sinfulness, feels his need of an inward resignation and confesses it with the offering of the symbolic sacrifice and requests that the grace of God may supply his need, *i. e.* may lead him by the sacrificial teaching to the completion of the sacrificial offering in faith. So there lies in the idea of sacrifice, as in the law, the spring of a positive movement; and as Christ is certainly the final cause of the law as the objective requirement of sacrifice, so is He of the sacrifice as the subjective law of life. The law and the sacrifice come together inseparably in the fulfillment which the life of Jesus Christ has brought. * * * * On the various theories which concern sacrifice, compare the dictionaries, particularly WINER; also the archæological works; especially also the article by OEHLER in HERZOG'S *Realency-clopädie*, entitled *Opfercultus im Alten Testament.* For more detailed treatment of the subject, see also my *Positive Dogmatik.* * * * First of all, the legal sacrifices are indeed, in the sacrificial system of worship, themselves real satisfactions, that is, the discharge of duties and the reparation for transgressions against the social law. But the social law would be entirely arbitrary if it had no higher sense; this sense is the prayer for grace to complete it, for perfection. It does not come finally to a satisfactory end if it does not attain to the granting of the prayer, to the peace of God, to expiation. In the first particular, the sacrifice is a real performance in the court, which can be misconceived to be self-righteousness;

in the second, it is a symbolic treatment of prayer as incense in the temple; in the highest particular, it is an act of the typical hope of faith, of the atonement in the holy of holies, which the priest accomplished with hazard and inward resignation of his life under the fatal effect of the sight of the majesty of God.

"These three particulars are displayed in the three different forms of sacrifice, *eucharistica, impetratoria, piacularia;* but so that whatever form predominates, the others are supposed with it. The trunk-root or fundamental form, however, is furnished by the burnt-offering, for which reason all sacrifices are burnt-offerings in a narrower or wider sense; all are God's fire, God's bread, on the altar; hence, in the first case the *Fire,* as the symbol of the Divine power, may consume the whole sacrifice (כָּלִיל); in the second case the *Blood* may signify the prevailing thought in sacrifice, as the symbol of the resignation of the soul, the life; the third case is the *Holy food,* the sacrificial meal, as a symbol of the consecration of life's enjoyment in the midst of life itself. These three particulars are found fully connected in the Passover, which forms the general theocratic hallowing of the natural principle of sacrifice, and pre-supposes the symbolical new birth, *i. e.* the circumcision or physical cleansing. So too in reference to the curse-sacrifice: *cherem.*" * * *

The sacrifices "are themselves divided into *pure* and *applied* forms of worship. The pure cultus-sacrifices are divided into *universal, fixed* and *casual.* The first are the Sabbath and the Feast-day sacrifices, normal sacrifices of all Israel; the last are those occasioned by and commanded in various circumstances. Both kinds, however, are often interchanged, absolutely as antitheses of the sacrifice of destruction, the *Cherem.*

"1. The hallowed fundamental form of the sacrifice—the Passover.

"2. The central point of all sacrifices, the imperishable symbolical idea, the burnt-offering.

"3. On the left hand of the burnt-sacrifice we find the sin and trespass-offerings, in which also the transition-forms come into consideration (see the Exegesis); on the right hand is the prosperity or salvation-offering—in the forms of the praise-offering, the votive (the prayer) offering, and that of the simple well-being—and besides generally, the hallowed slaying and the consecration of the blood.

"4. The summit of all sacrifices, the great propitiatory sacrifice, in which the antithesis of the salvation-offering with the curse-offering is rendered especially prominent in the he-goat of the Azazel." [But on this see the Exegetical, ch. xvi.]

"As forms of the applied sacrifice, appear the covenant-sacrifice, the sacrifices at the consecration of the priests, the various sacrifices of purification, the central sacrifice of purification, or the ashes of the red heifer, and in antithetical position the jealousy-sacrifice and the sacrifice at the festival of a completed vow." * * *

LANGE then describes *the sacrificial material* and *the sacrificial act,* which are sufficiently treated in the commentary. In conclusion, he adds: "The line of the three altars, the altar of burnt-offering, the altar of incense, and the mercy-seat, is completed by still a fourth hallowed place of sacrifice without the camp, that is, the ash-heap of the red heifer, for the meaning of which Heb. xiii. 13 is a passage especially to be considered. Out beyond this place lay the wilderness, also the place of death for the *cherem,* the curse-sacrifice.

"With the gradations of the altar, the gradations of the sprinking of the blood are parallel even to the sprinkling" [before] "the mercy-seat in the holy of holies. They stand in contrast to the gradations of the burning whose minimum appears in the meat-offering" [which was, however, in some cases wholly consumed (Lev. vi. 22)], "and whose maximum is in the burnt-offering. In the blood is expressed the entire resignation of man to death; in the fire, the complete consuming power of God over man's strength of life.

"In the whole matter of sacrifice the idea of communion, of the feast of fellowship, between God and man becomes prominent in many ways, and is especially represented by the table of shew-bread, and by the portions of the priests. In reference to this communion, however, Jehovah has exclusively reserved to Himself the blood and the fat, and has exclusively forbidden leaven in the offering (though not in what was presented before God for the use of the priests) and honey. But the people are represented, too, in the whole priestly communion, and receive the whole effect of their service: the blessing of Jehovah, which also

rises in distinct gradations, from the absolution in the court, the light in the temple, to the vision of God in the holy of holies; and thence comes back to the people under corresponding conditions: confession, prayer, consecration by means of death (*Todeswiehe*). Thus also the further relations of the sacrifice are explained. The sacrifice of the heart unfolds itself in the sacrifice of the lips, in prayer, and in the sacrifices of the respective death-consecrations, or of the renunciation and dedication in vows by which the Nazarite was connected with the priests."

In his *Homiletik in Lev.*, LANGE further says: "The Israelitish sacrifice is taken into the care of Jehovah, is the sanctified offering, the symbol of the internal sacrifice, the type of the future completed sacrifice, the instruction which prepared for the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifices of Christianity. The difference between the outward and the inward sacrifice, between the symbol and the thought it expresses, is rendered definitely prominent even in the Old Testament.

"**Literature.**—See KEIL, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie. Die gottesdienstlichen Verhältnisse der Israeliten*, p. 47 ss. *Das mosaische Opfer*, p. 195 ss. BAEHR (see above). BRAMESFELD, *Der alttestamentliche Gottesdienst in seiner sinndbildlichen und vorbildlichen Bedeutung*. Gutersloh, 1864. HENGSTENBERG, *Die Opfer der heil. Schrift*. Berlin, 1859. KEIL, *Die Opfer des Alten Bundes* (GUERICKE'S *Zeitschrift*, 1836, 37). KLIEFOTH, *Die ursprüngliche Gottesdienstordnung der deutschen Kirche*. 1. Bel. Schwerin, 1858. KURTZ, *Der alttestamentliche Opfercultus*. Mittau, 1864. NEUMANN, *Die Opfer des Alten Bundes*. OEHLER, *Der Opfercultus*, in HERZOG'S *Realencyclopädie*. SARTORIUS, *Ueber den alt-und neutestamentlichen Kultus*. Stuttgart, 1852. THOLUCK, *Das Alte Testament in Neuen Testament*. Hamburg, 1849. LISKO, *Das Ceremonialgesetz des Alten Testaments, seine Erfüllung im Neuen Testament*. Berlin, 1842. WANGEMANN, *Die Opfer der heiligen Schrift nach der Lehre des Alten Testaments*. 2 Bde. Berlin, 1866. (Worthy of especial note is the catalogue of literature, Gen. Introd. A. § 5, B., and the statement in reference to the development of the ecclesiastical idea of sacrifice, *ib.* § 6)." Add: PHILO *de Victimis*. OUTRAM, *De sacrificiis*. London, 1677 (translated by ALLEN, London, 1817). SPENCER, *De legibus Hebræorum*, Tubingen, 1732. MAIMONIDES, *De sacrificiis*, London, 1683. CUDWORTH, *De Cœna Domini*, Leyden, 1773 (Vol. II., translation of *Intel. System*, Andover, 1837). A. A. SYKES, *Essay on the Nature, Design and Origin of Sacrifices*, 1748. J. D. MICHAELIS, *Commentaries on the Laws of Moses* (translated by A. SMITH, London, 1814). ROSENMUELLER, *Excursus II. in Lev.*, Leipsic, 1824. FABER, *On the Origin of Sacrifice*, London, 1827. J. DAVISON, *Inquiry into the Origin and Intent of Primitive Sacrifice* (*Remains*). THOLUCK, Diss. II. in App. to *Ep. to the Heb.* (Trans. by RYLAND, Edinb., 1842). F. D. MAURICE, *The Doctrine of Sacrifice deduced from Scripture*, Cambridge, 1854. KALISCH, *Lev.*, Pt. I., London, 1867. CLARK, Introd. to Lev. (*Speaker's Com.*), London and New York, 1872. Also further authorities cited by CONANT in SMITH'S *Bib. Dict.* Art. *Lev.*, Am. Ed.

LEVITICUS.

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES.

BOOK I.

OF APPROACH TO GOD.

CHAPS. I.—XVI.

"**FIRST DIVISION.—The sanctifying acts (or consecrations for God) to bring about typical holiness by means of various sacrifices, universally ordained for universal sin. The removal of the sinful condition incurred by inadvertence (pardonable sins בִּשְׁגָגָה chaps. I.—XVI. [a. positive enactments, I.—X.; b. negative, XI.—XVI.]).**"—LANGE.

PART I. THE LAWS OF SACRIFICE.

CHAPS. I.—VII.

FIRST SECTION.

CHAPS. I.—VI. 7.

[*Lange makes the division "Personal Sacrifices" Chapters I.—V.*]

A.—BURNT-OFFERINGS.

CHAP. I. 1–17.

1 AND the LORD called[1] unto Moses, and spake unto him out of the tabernacle[2] of
2 the [*omit* the[3]] congregation, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, If any man of you bring an offering unto the LORD,[4] ye shall bring your

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. וַיִּקְרָא in our text has the final א of smaller size than the other letters. The reason (leaving out of view Cabalistic interpretations) seems to be that suggested by Rosenmüller—that there was an ancient variation of the MSS., some having our present reading; while others, omitting the א, read וַיִּקַּר, Fut. Apoc. Niphal of קָרָה = and the Lord *met* (or *appeared to*) Moses. Comp. Num. xxiii. 4, 16.

[2] Ver. 1. אֹהֶל means strictly the covering of haircloth over the מִשְׁכָּן of boards with linen curtains. Both occur together, Ex. xl. 29. Both are translated in the A. V. alike by *tent* and by *tabernacle*, and both in the LXX. most frequently by σκηνή. In the original both are used to designate the structure in which the ark was placed. There is therefore no sufficient reason for changing the familiar name of *Tabernacle*.

[3] Ver. 1. מוֹעֵד is without the article, as always. The word is used very frequently (Lev. xxiii. 2, 4, 37, 44, *etc.*) of the religious festivals of the Law, of which the tabernacle was the centre, and perhaps both in the Heb. and the Chald. the "times of the festivals" is the most prominent idea of the word. Hence, as the place of assembly, the centre around which the congregation was at such times to gather, the Tabernacle came to be called אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד, as Jerusalem is called (Isa. xxxiii. 20) קִרְיַת מֹ֫עֲדֵנוּ. The proposal to translate *Tent of meeting* (Speaker's Com., Kalisch, Murphy, and many others) as referring to God's meeting with Moses, seems unsupported by the usage of the word, and is sustained by none of the ancient versions. (The LXX. and Vulgate take the word in the sense of *covenant* or *law*). The article, however, should be omitted. Nevertheless, Lange says "The Tabernacle is designated as the Tabernacle of the meeting. That the Israelites should assemble themselves in that place, is only the secondary result of the primary meeting with Jehovah."

[4] Ver. 2. The Masoretic punctuation places the Athnach on לַיהוָה, and this is sustained by the Sam., Chald., LXX.,

offering[5] of the cattle, *even* of the herd, and of the flock [of the cattle unto the LORD, ye shall bring your offering of the herd or of the flock].

3 If his offering *be* a burnt sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the[3]] congregation before the LORD[6] [offer it at the door of the tabernacle of
4 congregation for his acceptance before the LORD]. And he shall put his hand upon the head of the burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make
5 atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before the LORD: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon[7] the altar that *is by* [*before*] the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the[3]]
6 congregation. And he[8] shall flay the burnt offering, and cut it into his pieces.
7 And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay the wood in
8 order upon the fire: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the parts, the head, and the fat, in order upon the wood that *is* on the fire which *is* upon the altar:
9 but his inwards and his legs shall he[9] wash in water: and the priest shall burn all on the altar, *to be* a burnt sacrifice,[10] an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

10 And if his offering *be* of the flocks,[11] *namely*, of the sheep, or of the goats, for a
11 burnt sacrifice; he shall bring it a male without blemish.[12] [13]And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the LORD: and the priests, Aaron's sons,
12 shall sprinkle his blood round about upon[7] the altar. And he[14] shall cut it into his pieces, with his head and his fat: and the priest shall lay them in order on the
13 wood that *is* on the fire which *is* upon the altar: but he shall wash the inwards and the legs with water: and the priest shall bring *it* all, and burn *it* upon the altar: it *is* a burnt sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

14 And if the burnt sacrifice for his offering to the LORD *be* of fowls, then he shall
15 bring his offering of turtledoves, or of young pigeons. And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring [pinch] off his head, and burn *it* on the altar; and the
16 blood thereof shall be wrung out at [pressed out against] the side of the altar: and he shall pluck away his crop with his feathers [the filth thereof[15]], and cast it beside
17 the altar on the east part, by the place of the ashes: and he shall cleave it with the wings thereof, *but*[16] shall not divide *it* asunder: and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that *is* upon the fire: it *is* a burnt sacrifice, and offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

Vulg., and followed by the A. V. Houbigant suggests that it should rather be placed on the next word, הַבְּהֵמָה as in the Syr. The latter sense is followed in the commentary.

[5] Ver. 2. "Offerings" in the plural is read in the Sam., LXX., Vulg., and Syr.

[6] Ver. 3. לִרְצֹנוֹ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה. The translation of the A. V. is defended by Grotius, but most interpreters follow the unanimous voice of the ancient versions in giving the sense as corrected above. Comp. Ex. xxviii. 38; Lev. xxii. 20, 21, *etc.* The A. V. varies in the translation even in the same passage, as Lev. xxii. 19, 20, 21, 29.

[7] Ver. 5. The sense is, upon all the sides of the altar, not on its upper surface.

[8] Ver. 6. The Sam. and LXX. by reading the verbs of this verse in the plural, apparently make the flaying and cutting up of the victim the act of the priests.

[9] Ver. 9. The Sam. and the LXX. here also, by the use of the plural, make the washing the act of the priests.

[10] Ver. 9. The Sam. followed by the LXX. and Syr., read עֹלָה הִיא = this is the burnt-offering, *i. e.*, the law of the burnt-offerings.

[11] Ver. 10. The Sam. followed by the LXX. reads וְאִם־מִן־הַצֹּאן עֹלָה קָרְבָּנוֹ לַיהוָה, the Sam. omitting the subsequent עֹלָה, which makes the sense clearer.

[12] Ver. 10. The Sam. adds—at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation shall he offer it.

[13] Ver. 11. The LXX. prefixes from ver. 4, *καὶ ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ*—which is of course to be understood.

[14] Ver. 12. The Sam. (now followed both by the LXX. and the Vulg.) here again as in vers. 6 and 9 reads the plural.

[15] Ver. 16. בְּנֹצָתָהּ (Sam. תו—) is variously translated. In the LXX. and Vulg., as in the A. V., it is rendered feathers; in the Sam. Vers., however, the Chald. of Onkelos, of Jonathan, and of Jerusalem, and in the Syr., the idea is *the food in the crop*, or the filth connected therewith, as is expressed in the margin of the A. V. By Gesenius and Fuerst it is translated as filth or excrement in the crop; they consider it a contracted form of Part. Niph. of יָצָא. This is probably the true sense. Lange explains it "the excrement from the crop yet to be found in the body."

[16] Ver. 17. The Sam., 15 MSS., and all the versions supply the conjunction, which must of course be understood.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The Divine presence having now been manifested in the newly erected tabernacle (Ex. xl. 34), God according to His promise (Ex. xxv. 22), there reveals Himself to Moses, and makes known through him His will to the people. As this was the place where they were to draw nigh to Him, the first commands uttered from the tabernacle relate to the means of this approach, and occupy the first sixteen chapters of Leviticus. Of these, seven are concerned with the general laws of sacrifice, of which it would appear some knowledge must have been previously communicated to Moses to make the directions of Ex. xxix. intelligible to him, and also to guide him in the sacrifices offered by himself, Ex. xl. 28, 29; but now for the first time he is directed to proclaim these laws to the people. The law is first declared in regard to the people's part in the offerings (i.—vi. 7), although this involves incidentally something also of the duties of the priests; this is followed by special instructions chiefly for the priests (vi. 8—vii. 38), although the line cannot be so sharply drawn that this part shall not also contain something for the people. Each kind of offering is treated by itself, the first chapter being occupied with the whole burnt-offering, which must always be an animal, but might be either a quadruped (2-13), or a fowl (14-17). The former again, might be either "of the herd," *i. e.*, a bullock (3-9), or "of the flock," *i. e.*, a sheep or a goat (10-13). The directions for burnt-sacrifices are arranged under these three heads.

Ver. 1. **The Lord.**—Jehovah is the distinctive Divine title throughout Leviticus, the names אֲדֹנָי (occurring so frequently elsewhere), שַׁדַּי, and the very common אֵל do not occur, nor even the ordinary אֱלֹהִים, except the last joined with a possessive pronoun or some other construction, to mark Him as in a peculiar sense the God of Israel.

Out of the tabernacle of congregation.—There can be no reasonable doubt that this is the newly-erected tabernacle; the attempt to prove that these laws were given from some other tent upon the slopes of Mt. Sinai by reference to Lev. vii. 38, has no foundation, as the parallelism of that ver. shows that *mount* is there only another expression for the place called the *wilderness* of Sinai.

"Ver. 2 ss. *The common regulations concerning all the sacrifices.* The whole motive of animal sacrifice is appropriately exhibited in the verb קָרַב *to draw near;* in the Hiphil *to cause to draw near.* The sense of the word is fully shown in Jer. xxx. 21. Sinful man, as such, dares not draw near to Jehovah. But Jehovah forms one chosen out of His people (the Messiah) for the purpose of approach, until he draws nearest of all to Him, touches Him, yields up himself to Him, and becomes ONE with Him. With reverent dread man, conscious of sin, pushes forward the guiltless animal as an offering of drawing near (Korban), as a symbol of his desire to draw near himself to Jehovah. As yet the sacrifice was not commanded in its particulars; but the general idea of sacrifice as now necessary was commanded, and in every case it must be of the cattle, either large or small, and thus of the clean domestic animals. The subsequent addition of pigeons and turtle-doves are as substitutes." Lange.

If any man of you bring.—The sacrifices of the first three chapters were those of individuals, and were purely voluntary in so far as respects their being offered at all; when, however, the individual had determined to offer any of them, the instructions as to the selection of the victim, and the manner of offering, were minute and peremptory. The duty of the priests in regard to these offerings was simply ministerial.

Offering.—קָרְבָּן, always translated by the LXX. δῶρον, and most frequently by the Vulg. *oblatio.* Except in two instances in Ezek. (xx. 28; xl. 43), and in two of the same consonants differently pointed in Neh. (x. 34 (35); xiii. 31), its use is confined to Lev. and Num. It is the technical word for an offering to the Lord, including sacrifices both bloody, as here, and unbloody as in ch. ii., and also dedicatory offerings for the sanctuary, as in Num. vii.

Ye shall bring.—The Rabbins infer from this use of the plural that two or more persons might unite in the same offering. This was undoubtedly the fact; but does not seem to be the reason for the use of the plural here, which is rather required simply by the generality of the law. Comp. ii. 11, 12, *etc.*

Of the cattle unto the Lord.—The Masoretic punctuation must here be modified in order to represent the systematic arrangement intended. See Textual Note 4. The בְּהֵמָה = quadruped, is in contradistinction to the fowls of ver. 14; and the direction is that if an offering of this kind be brought, it shall be taken from the herd or the flock, not from wild animals. The word sometimes includes all quadrupeds, wild and tame (Gen. vi. 7; Ex. ix. 25, *etc.*), but is more commonly used, according to the restriction here, of the domestic animals. It includes both the herd and the flock. The range of animals allowed for sacrifice was much narrower than that of those clean for food, and far narrower than among the heathen. See Knobel, p. 352. The Egyptians, among other victims, offered swine, and the Hindoos and Germans, horses.

Vers. 3–9. The law of the burnt-offering of a bullock, עֹלָה = whole burnt-offering. Lange: "The names: עֹלָה the going up (in a specific sense, for all sacrifices were brought up on the altar), כָּלִיל the whole, the entirely finished, consumed, burned, *holocaustum.* Thus the burnt-offering, or the fire-offering in the most especial sense, which was entirely consumed in the fire, forms the central point of the whole sacrificial system." "The New Testament antitype of the burnt-offering is expressed by Paul in Rom. xii. 1." See the preliminary note on sacrifices, p. 12.

Ver. 3. **A male.**—The burnt-offering, unlike the sin and peace-offering, must always be a male. The case of the cows offered in 1 Sam.

vi. 14, was altogether exceptional, and the red heifer (Num. xix. 1-10) was not burned upon the altar at all.—**Without blemish,** LXX., ἄμωμος. The bullock, like all other victims, (xxii. 19-24) except in the case of free-will offerings, must be free from bodily faults either of defect or redundancy; and it was provided that no victim obtained by the price of a dog, or of whoredom, might be offered to God (Deut. xxiii. 18). It was the Jewish custom to appoint a priest as a special inspector of victims, to whose scrutiny every animal must be subjected before being offered.—**At the door.**—At the wide entrance of the court in which the great altar stood. Lange, however, considers that the door "not of the court, but of the Holy Place, is the boundary between the holy things and the region of that to be hallowed, and therefore the appropriate point for the meeting which in the name of Jehovah was obtained by the priests for the people through the sacrifice." This presentation of the victim before the Lord was the technical *offering*, so essential a part of the sacrifice that it is often put for the sacrifice itself. The details of the sacrifice were so ordered that when occasion required, great multitudes of victims might be offered quickly and without confusion. After the erection of the temple, rings were fixed in the pavement, to which the victims were secured; with a sharp knife the throat was then cut at one stroke quite through the arteries and the jugular veins, so that the blood might flow rapidly into a vessel held underneath; this vessel was then (when there were many sacrifices) passed from hand to hand by a row of priests and Levites extending to the altar; meantime the flaying and cutting up of the victim was going on; on the north side of the altar there were eight stone pillars connected by three rows of beams, each bearing a row of hooks; upon these the victims were hung, the largest upon the highest hooks, the smaller upon the others. Outram I., xvi., and the authorities there cited. By such means an almost incredible number of victims are said to have been sacrificed with perfect order in a short time.—**For his acceptance before the Lord.**—It was the object of the burnt-offering, as of all sacrifices, to secure to the offerer the good pleasure of God. How far the burnt-offering partook of a strictly expiatory character has already been discussed in the preliminary essay; but that this, with all other voluntary offerings, sprang from a sense of need on the part of the worshipper, and a desire by some means to draw nearer to God, there can be no doubt. This expression, however, as Knobel notes, is never used in connection with the sin-offering, whose peculiar office was to obtain the pardon, rather than the gracious favor of God. Lange: "The sacrifices follow one another in a natural sequence. The burnt-offering denotes the giving up of life to God; the meat-offering, the giving up of life's enjoyment. Both were offered for a covering for the universal sinfulness of man. Only the expiatory sacrifices relate to particular sins."

Ver. 4. **And he shall put his hand upon the head.**—This solemn and essential part of the ceremonial is always specified when the law is given in detail, not only in connection with the burnt-offerings, but also with the peace-offerings (iii. 2, 8, 13), and the sin-offerings (iv. 4, 15, 24, 29, 33); where in the brevity of the description it is omitted (ver. 11, ch. v. 6, 15, 18,) it is yet to be understood. As to the significance of the act, a great variety of opinions has been held; by many, both of the ancients and moderns, it has been understood to symbolize the transfer of his sins from the offerer to the victim, or the substitution of the victim to die in his stead (Theodoret, *Quæst.* 61 in Ex., and many others). This view has countenance from the laying on of *both* the hands of the high-priest on the head of the scape-goat on the day of atonement (xvi. 21) for the express purpose of "putting all their sins upon the head of the goat," that he might "bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land not inhabited;" but the ritual is here very different, and this goat was not burned upon the altar. On the other hand in the case of the blasphemer who was to be stoned (xxiv. 14), all the witnesses were to lay their hands upon his head, clearly not for the purpose of transferring their sins to him. By others the act has been regarded as a surrender and dedication of the offerer's property to God; by still others as a dedication of himself through the victim representing him; Lange: "The laying (pressing) on of the hand has the effect of substituting in a typical sense the animal to be offered for the offerer (for him לוֹ). It denotes the transferring of the individual life to the offering in a symbolical sense, not merely the giving up of this possession (as a gift) to Jehovah." Various other views also have been advocated. None of them, however, can claim exclusively the sanction of Scripture, which prescribes the act, but does not define its significance. Neither do any of them rest upon evidence independent of preconceived views, and of the doctrinal interpretation of other Scriptures. This much will be generally admitted: That the act connected the offerer personally with the victim, and denoted that his sacrifice was offered solemnly and for the purpose of securing to himself that "covering" or atonement of which mention is immediately afterwards made. The connection of the two clauses shows that the laying on of the hand was directly connected with this atonement. It was certainly an expression of faith in the use of the means God had appointed for drawing near to Him, and the act may be beyond the reach of a closer analysis.

Accepted—the word is of the same root and sense as in ver. 3.

To make atonement for him.—לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו. This verb is not used in the Kal. In the Piel the primary sense is *to cover*, and hence to *atone for*. It is used sometimes simply with the accus. of the thing (Ps. lxv. 4; lxxviii. 38; Dan. ix. 24), but usually with עַל of the thing (Ps. lxxix. 9; Jer. xviii. 23, *etc.*), or of the person (ch. xix. 22), or with both (ch. v. 18); less frequently with לְ, and more rarely with עַל of the person and מִן of the thing (iv. 26, *etc.*); seldom with בְּ of the thing (ch. xvii. 11). The phrase is used chiefly in reference to the sin and trespass-

offerings (chs. iv., v., vi.) and but rarely in connection with the burnt-offerings. It is here used in connection with the laying on of the hand of the offerer, not as in the case of the sin-offering (iv. 20, 26, 35) and the trespass-offering (v. 6, 10, 13. 18; vi. 7, *etc.*), with the act of the priest, although in all cases the mediatorial function of the priest was, as here, necessarily involved.

Ver. 5. **He shall kill.**—The killing, skinning, washing and preparation of the victim, were the duty of the offerer, or, according to Outram, of some clean person appointed by him. Lange: "This is also an expression of the free-will of the sacrificer. He must indeed slay his own offering himself, just as the devout can offer his will to God only in free self-determination. Only false priests took the sacrifice by craft or force into the court, and slew it themselves, or had it slain at their command." The functions of the priest were concerned with the presentation and sprinkling of the blood, and the burning of the victim upon the altar. In the case, however, of national offerings, the offerer's part also was undertaken by the priests assisted by the Levites (2 Chr. xxix. 24, 34), apparently not in consequence of their office, but as representatives of the whole people. So also in the case of the Passovers of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxx. 17) and of Josiah (*ib.* xxxv. 10, 11) the Levites performed these duties on behalf of the people, because many of them were disqualified by uncleanness. Hence, as appears in the ancient versions, there has arisen a difference of opinion as to the part performed by the offerer.

Kill.—שָׁחַט is a general word exactly rendered, and is frequently used for killing in sacrifice. It does not therefore need to be changed. The technical word used only for sacrifice is זָבַח, while הֲמִית = *to put to death* is never used in this connection.

The bullock.—בֶּן בָּקָר = lit., *son of an ox*, applied to a calf (ix. 2) and to a mature young bull (פַּר iv. 3, 14).

Before the Lord—*i. e.*, in immediate view of the place where His presence was especially manifested. Knobel (*in loco*) notes how the slaughtering of the victim where it might be considered ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ was provided for among the heathen.

And the priests.—With the blood began the exclusively priestly functions. In the case of very numerous sacrifices the Levites might catch the blood and pass it to the priests (2 Chr. xxx. 16), but the "sprinkling" was always done by the priests alone.

Sprinkle.—The word זָרַק is a different one from the נָזָה (more common in the Hiphil form הִזָּה) generally used of sprinkling with the finger or with hyssop, and refers to the throwing of the blood by a jerk against the sides of the altar from the מִזְרָק or bowl in which the blood of the victim was caught. Rosenmüller shows that the word cannot be translated, as some would have it, by *pour*. The LXX. usually, but not always, renders the former by προσχεῖν, the latter by ῥαίνειν. There seems, however, no sufficient reason for changing the translation of the A. V. The priest was to sprinkle the blood against all the sides of the altar; and this was done, according to Jewish tradition, by throwing it from the bowl successively against the opposite corners of the altar, so that it sprinkled against each of the adjoining sides. The same law held for the peace-offerings (iii. 2, 8, 13; ix. 18), and trespass-offerings (vii. 2); but not for the sin-offering (iv. 5-7). Lange: "The blood is the symbol of the spiritual life which is given up to Jehovah (at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation) but which may not be consumed with the body of mortality by the fire of God's appointment. As it is said that it is 'to be brought up,' it follows that the slaying belongs between the altar and the door of the court, where the station of the sacrificer is. That it must be poured out on the altar before the burnt-offering can be kindled, tells us plainly that no offering up of life or body is profitable unless the soul has first been given to Jehovah. But this has been given up to the God of the altar, not surrendered to the altar-fire to destroy or change."

Before the door of the tabernacle.—The altar was in full view of the gate-way or door, as it is expressed Ex. xl. 6 לִפְנֵי פֶּתַח.

Ver. 6. **He shall flay.**—The offerer skinned the animal, and the skin was the perquisite of the officiating priest (vii. 8). Kalisch, however, says that "the flaying was probably performed by a Levite under the direction of the officiating priest." Lange says, "With the slaying the life departs, with the skin goes the old appearance of life, under the conventionally commanded division disappears also the old figure of life, in the burning disappears the substance of the body itself. Only the blood, the soul, does not disappear, but passes through the purifying process of sacrifice, and goes hence into the invisible, to God. The pouring out of the blood at the foot of the altar round about, can in no case mean 'the convenient disposal of the blood.' The blood goes through the sanctified earth to God."

Cut it into his pieces—*i. e.*, properly divide it according to custom.

Vers. 7–9. **The priests.**—We here again come upon those essential parts of the sacrifice which could be performed by the priests alone. The direction to put fire upon the altar is understood by Knobel and others to refer only to the first sacrifice upon the newly-erected altar, as it was required afterwards (vi. 13) that the fire should be kept always burning upon the altar; or it may be understood of so arranging the fire—when not in use, raked together—as to consume the sacrifice. The head is especially mentioned in order that the whole animal may be expressly included, since it would not be considered one of the "pieces" into which the animal was divided. The *fat* פֶּדֶר used only in connection with burnt-offerings (vers. 8, 12; viii. 20) probably means the fat separated from the entrails and taken out to wash. Bochart, *adeps a carne sejunctus*. All was to be laid *in order* upon the wood; everything about the sacrifice must have that method and regard to propriety becoming in an act of worship. According to Jew-

ish writers, the parts were so laid upon one another as to have the same relative positions as in the living animal. Outram I. 16, § 13.

His inwards and his legs, which were to be washed, are generally understood of the lower viscera and the legs, especially the hind legs, below the knee; it is doubtful whether the washing was required for the heart, the lungs and the liver—LXX. *ἐγκοίλια καὶ οἱ ποδές*; Vulg., *intestina et pedes.* Lange: "Head and Fat. The knowledge of earth and its prosperity must first pass into the fiery death; then also the purified organs of growth, nourishment, and motion."

Shall burn.—הִקְטִיר = to cause to ascend in smoke, as incense. The word is used only of the burning of incense, of the sacred lamps, and of sacrifices, and is a very different one from שָׂרַף the word for common burning, which is applied to the victims, or parts of victims burned without the camp (iv. 12, 21, *etc.*). It connects the bloody sacrifice with the incense, and shows that the object of the burning was not to destroy the victim, but rather, as declared just below, to cause its essence to ascend as a sweet savor unto God.

An offering made by fire.—אִשֶּׁה a word applied exclusively to sacrifices (although sometimes to the parts of them eaten by the priests, Deut. xviii. 1; Josh. xiii. 14), in xxiv. 7 applied to the incense laid upon the shew bread. The appearance of tautology, hardly to be avoided in the translation, does not exist in the original. The word is usually associated, as here, with the phrase "**a sweet savour unto the Lord**" (LXX. *ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας*). This phrase is applied to all sacrifices, but belongs peculiarly to the burnt-offering; as the phrase *to make atonement* belongs peculiarly, but not exclusively, to the sin-offering. Its intent is plainly to describe the divine pleasure in the sacrifice offered. Theodoret (*Quæst.* 62 in Ex.): "By human things he teaches Divine. As we delight in sweet odors, so he calls the sacrifice made according to the law a sweet savor. But that this is not to be taken in the naked letter is shown both by the Divine nature which is incorporeal, and by the ill smell of the burnt bones. For what can smell worse than these?" Lange: "The conception is not exhausted in the conception of a sweet, pleasant smell. As in a pictorial sense, anger is represented by the snorting of the nostrils, so the resignation of self to God and His rule is called a savor well-pleasing to the nose."

Vers. 10–13. The burnt-offering from the flock. The law here being essentially the same as for the bullock is more briefly given, except in regard to the place of slaying. The offering might be either from the sheep or goats, but the former were probably more esteemed.

Ver. 11. **On the side of the altar northward.**—So also the table of shew-bread with the continual meat-offering stood on the north side of the holy place (Ex. xxvi. 35). The east side of the altar was the place for the heap of ashes on the side towards the door by which they must be carried out; the west side would have been inconvenient, being towards the holy place with the laver between; the south side had probably (as Josephus says was the case in the second temple, Bell. Jud. V. 5, 6, *ἀπὸ μεσημβρίας ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀνοδος*) the ascent to the altar which must be kept clear; so that the north side alone remained. Lange: "Death is something belonging to the mysterious night, and belongs as a night-side of life, to the night-side of the earth; just as also the priestly eating of the shew-bread must be considered as a night meal." In the same place were also to be slain the sin-offerings (iv. 24, 29, 33) and the trespass-offerings (vii. 2). There being ample room in the court for the sacrifice of the smaller victims, which also required less time in their preparation, they were killed near the altar instead of at the door. Nothing is said of the peace-offerings which, according to Mishna, might be killed in any part of the court. When not too numerous, however, they would have been more conveniently slain in the same place.

Ver. 12. **His head,** *etc.*—is to be connected *per zeugma* with *he shall cut, i. e.*, **he shall cut it into his pieces and** (sever) **his head and his fat.**

Vers. 14–17. The burnt-offering of fowls. From chap. v. 7-11; xii. 8, it is probable that this offering was for those who were unable to bring the more costly offerings. It might be either of turtledoves, or of *young* pigeons; but only one bird was required. The turtledoves (*turtur auritus*) appear in vast numbers in Palestine early in April, and are easily captured; later in the season they entirely disappear. The common pigeon has been bred in the country from time immemorial, and also is found wild, at all seasons, in great abundance; but when full-grown is difficult of capture. It has, however, in the course of the year, several broods of two each, which may be easily taken on the nest. Hence, in the case of the pigeon, the mention of the age. Knobel observes that the allowing of doves or pigeons in sacrifice was quite exceptional among the ancient Orientals, and distinguished the Hebrew law from others. We have then in this a fresh instance of the especial care for the poor in the Divine law.

Ver. 15. **And the priest shall.**—In this case the offerer's part must be performed by the priest to prevent the loss of the small quantity of blood contained in the bird. No mention is made of the laying on of hands which was perhaps omitted on account of the diminutive size of the victim.

Pinch off his head.—מָלַק occurs only here and in v. 8, and its precise meaning has been much questioned. In v. 8 it is expressly limited by the provision that the head was not to be entirely separated from the body in the case of the bird to be eaten by the priest; in regard to the other bird (v. 7, 10), it was to be treated as the bird for a burnt-offering. As there is no such limitation here, as it is implied that the treatment was different from that of the bird in v. 8, and as the head was to be immediately burned on the altar, while something further was to be done to the body, the precept must be understood to require an entire separation of the head. So Outram, following the Mishna and other Jewish authorities. Lange, however, considers from the analogy of v. 8, that the head was not to

be disjoined from the body. He translates מָלַק, "*cleave in two*, so that death is produced and the blood can flow out as from a vessel. The closely related מָלַח means apparently *to tear off;* the closely related פָּלַח means *to cleave, cut into.*" The LXX. has ἀποκνίζειν in both places. The exact sense seems best expressed by the margin of the A. V.—*pinch off the head with the nail.*

Pressed out against.—The small quantity of blood made it practically impossible to deal with it as in the case of the larger sacrifices. The sense of נִמְצָה וגו׳ is that the blood of the bird should be thoroughly squeezed out against the side of the altar.

Ver. 16. **His crop with its filth.** The obscure word בְּנֹצָתָהּ has occasioned much difference of opinion; see Textual Notes. The rendering here given is ably supported at length by Rosenmüller. This was to be flung on the heap of ashes and refuse east of the altar.

Ver. 17. **He shall cleave.**—The priest was to split the bird open, (by its wings, or by means of its outspread wings, Lange), but so as not to separate the parts; in the same way a fowl is now prepared for broiling. Lange: "The direction was given to take the place, as far as possible, of the cutting in pieces of the burnt-offering, *i. e.*, the destruction of the figure of the body."

A sweet savour.—The repetition of the same words as in ver. 9 and ver. 13, shows that this humbler sacrifice of the poor was acceptable equally with the more costly sacrifice of the rich.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The offerings mentioned in this chapter were purely voluntary; yet when offered, the law in regard to them was strict and sharply defined. In this the Israelites were taught a general principle of the Divine will. Whoever seeks to draw near to God must do so in the way of God's own appointment. That worship only is acceptable to Him which is in accordance with His will. Not that which may seem most effective, not that which may be thought best adapted to man's needs; but simply that which God approves may be offered to Him.

II. These offerings must be "perfect," *i. e.*, without blemish, and the most scrupulous cleanliness was required in offering them. These requirements were of course necessary in view of the typical relation of the sacrifices to Christ; but they also taught the general principle that in his offerings to God man may not try to put off upon Him what is of inferior value—the light coin, or the scraps of unoccupied time. God is to be served with the best that man can command. And in this service regard must be had to the infinite purity and holiness of Him with whom we have to do.

III. The sacrifice might not be completed by the offerer. Man, being sinful, was unworthy to offer propitiation to God for himself. The priest must intervene for the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the victim. In view of the peculiar virtue everywhere attributed to blood as "the life" (Gen. ix. 4, *etc.*), and the especial office of that "life" in connection with the disturbed relations between God and man (ch. xvii. 10-12, *etc.*), and of the appointment of the priest to this duty, it is plain that he here acts in a mediatorial capacity. As Calvin (*in loco*) notes, "ministers of reconciliation must be sought, made competent to their high function by Divine anointing. This points to Christ not only as the Victim offered for sin, but also (as is shown at length in the Ep. to the Heb.) as Himself the Priest." In general it establishes the principle that they only may exercise authority on God's behalf whom He has commissioned for the purpose.

IV. In the provision for a less costly burnt-offering, we see that while in His providence God distributes unequally the means of offering to Himself, He yet provides that an equally acceptable offering shall be within the reach of all. The poor widow's two mites were greater in His eyes than the costly gifts of the rich. The same thing is true when the propitiatory character of the offering is considered. Before God all souls are alike precious, and all equally have the opportunity of drawing near to Him.

V. In the New Testament certain words and phrases are applied to Christ which are the Septuagint translations of the technical words here and elsewhere used of the sacrifices. Thus He is called (Eph. v. 2) προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, and in Heb. ii. 17 He is said to be πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, and in 1 Jno. ii. 2, and iv. 10, He is described as our ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. It seems impossible to suppose that the Apostles could have used these expressions and others like them without intending to point to Christ as the Antitype of the sacrifices, and as actually accomplishing that which they had prefigured. From the work of Christ, therefore, in effecting reconciliation between God and man, light is thrown back upon the function of the sacrifices; and that function once established, we may learn again from the sacrifices something of the nature of the propitiatory work of Christ.

VI. Wordsworth notes that a new *Parashah*, or section of the law, as read in Synagogues, begins at i. 1, and extends to vi. 7. "The parallel *Haphtarah*," or Section of the Prophets, "is Isa. xliii. 21—xliv. 23, where God reproves Israel for their neglect of His worship, and promises them forgiveness of sins, and comforts the church with the pledges of divine mercy. Thus the ancient Jewish church, when listening to the law concerning offerings for sin, declared its faith in a better Covenant, and in larger outpourings of divine favor and spiritual grace in Christ."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The course of God's dealings with man always, since man's fall, is to bring about a closer communion with Himself, as man is able to bear it. The legislation from Mt. Sinai was a great advance; but here there is a fresh advance. The Divine voice calls no longer from the Mount, but

from the tabernacle in the midst of the congregation. Thus another step is taken towards God's speaking "unto us by His Son."

Provision is made in these three chapters for voluntary sacrifices. The definitely prescribed duties of man are always a minimum; God requires of man the absolute devotion of himself and all that he is and has; this is recognized in the law by the provision for voluntary sacrifices and free-will-offerings of every kind.

All sacrifices were types of Christ inasmuch as after His sacrifice all others ceased. Origen. No one sacrifice could express the manifoldness of that which He wrought; therefore the several aspects of His work are adumbrated by various types. In this chapter we have the whole burnt-offering, the most general and comprehensive, as the most ancient, of the sacrifices; it is therefore the one which in the most general way sets forth the sacrifice of Christ. In so far as it became specialized by the introduction of other kinds of sacrifice, it is thought to be a symbol of entire consecration. It therefore typifies the entire consecration of Christ to God, and through Him, that of His followers, according to the allusion in Rom. xii. 1, which probably has this sacrifice more particularly in view.

Whatever is offered to God must be perfect in its kind. The offering may be varied in value according to the ability of the offerer, for all souls are alike precious to God, and He provides that all may be able to draw near to Him. Still, from the largest to the smallest offering, none may be allowed with blemish or defect.

On each sacrifice the offerer must lay his hands: so must man identify himself with what he offers to God. Such offering is a serious and a personal matter, and one may not delegate such duty to another; but must give to it personal thought and care. Sinful man cannot directly approach the Majesty on high, before whom he stands as a sinner; he must come through a Mediator, typified of old by the priest, and He "makes atonement for him."

As the law had but "a shadow of good things to come," (Heb. x. 1), so do they who now consecrate themselves to God offer that real sacrifice which the Israelites, offering various animals under the law, did but prefigure. Theodoret.

B.—OBLATIONS (MEAT-OFFERINGS).

Chapter II. 1–16.

1 And when any [a soul[1]] will offer a meat-offering [an offering of an oblation[2]]
unto the Lord, his offering shall be *of* fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and
2 put frankincense thereon:[3] and he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests: and
he shall take thereout his handful of the flour thereof, and of the oil thereof, with[4]
all the frankincense thereof; and the priest shall burn the memorial of it upon the
3 altar, *to be* an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord: and the
remnant of the meat-offering [oblation[2]] *shall be* Aaron's and his sons': *it is* a thing
most holy of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.

4 And if thou bring an oblation of a meat-offering [an offering of an oblation[2]]
baken in the oven, *it shall be* unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or
5 unleavened wafers anointed with oil. And if thy oblation *be* a meat-offering [offer-
ing *be* an oblation[2]] *baken* in a pan, it shall be *of* fine flour unleavened, mingled
6 with oil. Thou shalt[5] part it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it[6] *is* a meat-offering

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. נֶפֶשׁ.—As this word is generally rendered *a soul* in the A. V., especially in the similar places, iv. 2; v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17; vi. 2, *etc.*, it seems better to preserve as far as may be uniformity of translation.

[2] Ver. 1. The words here translated in the A. V. *meat-offering* are the same as those rendered in ver. 4 *an oblation of a meat-offering*. In this technical language of the law it is certainly desirable to preserve a strict consistency of translation, even if it must sometimes cause an appearance of tautology. The word קָרְבָּן will therefore be rendered throughout *offering*; *gift* might be in itself considered a better translation; but as it is already rendered *offering* twenty-nine times in Lev., and almost universally (with only two exceptions) in Num., less change is required to make that translation uniform. On the other hand מִנְחָה is already always in Lev. *meat-offering* in the A. V., and generally so in Num.; but the sense of *meat* has so generally changed since that version was made, that the term had better be replaced. In this book therefore it will be always rendered *oblation*, as it is in the Vulg. very frequently *oblatio*.

[3] Ver. 1. The Sam. and LXX. add *oblatio est*, *i. e.*, this is the law of the oblation.

[4] Ver. 2. With: for a similar construction of עַל, see Ex. xii. 8.

[5] Ver. 6. פָּתוֹת; on this use of the Infin. abs. comp. Ex. xiii. 3; xx. 8.

[6] Ver. 6. The ancient form הִוא is here changed in ten MSS. and in the Sam. to the later הִיא.

7 [an oblation[2]]. And if thy oblation *be* a meat-offering [offering *be* an oblation[2]]
baken in the frying-pan [*boiled* in the pot[7]], it shall be made *of* fine flour with oil.
8 And thou shalt bring the meat-offering [oblation[2]] that is made of these things
unto the LORD: and when it is presented unto the priest, he shall bring[8] it unto
9 the altar. And the priest shall take from the meat-offering [oblation[2]] a memorial
thereof, and shall burn *it* upon the altar: *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet
10 savour unto the LORD. And that which is left of the meat-offering [oblation[2]] *shall*
be Aaron's and his sons': *it is* a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made
11 by fire. No meat-offering [oblation[2]], which ye shall bring unto the LORD, shall
be made with leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering
12 of the LORD made by fire. As for the oblation [As an[9] offering[2]] of the first-fruits,
ye shall offer them unto the LORD: but they shall not be burnt on the altar for a
13 sweet savour. And every oblation of thy meat-offering [offering of thy oblation[2]]
shalt thou season with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant of
thy God to be lacking from thy meat-offering [oblation[2]]: with all thine offerings
14 thou shalt offer salt. And if thou offer a meat-offering [an oblation[2]] of thy [the]
first-fruits unto the LORD, thou shalt offer for the meat-offering [an oblation[2]] of
thy first-fruits, green ears of corn [grain[10]] dried [roasted[11]] by the fire, *even* corn
15 [grain[10]] beaten out of full ears. And thou shalt put oil upon it, and lay frankin-
16 cense thereon: it[12] *is* a meat-offering [an oblation[2]]. And the priest shall burn
the memorial of it, *part* of the beaten corn [grain[10]] thereof, and *part* of the oil
thereof, with all the frankincense thereof: *it is* an offering made by fire unto the
LORD.

[7] Ver. 7. מַרְחֶשֶׁת, derived (Gesenius, Fuerst) from רָחַשׁ, to boil up, and interpreted by Maimonides, Knobel, Keil and others of a pot or kettle for boiling;—"a deep vessel suitable for boiling flour and other substances thoroughly." Kalisch.

[8] Ver. 8. "נָגַשׁ in Hiph. is here used as the enhanced, second power of קָרַב in Hiph. as in Jer. xxx. 21." Lange.

[9] Ver. 12. The A. V. is singularly unfortunate; this clause plainly refers to the leaven and honey of ver. 11.

[10] Ver. 14. *Corn* is in this country so generally understood of maize that it seems better to substitute the more general word.

[11] Ver. 14. *Dried* does not sufficiently give the sense of קָלוּי=*roasted.*

[12] Ver. 15. Eighteen MSS. and the Sam here again, as in ver. 6, read הִיא.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The oblation, or meat-offering, naturally follows next after the burnt-offering, because it was usually an accompaniment of that offering. That it was invariably so has been often maintained (Outram, Bähr, Kurtz, *etc.*), and indeed it was always offered, and also a drink-offering, with most of the other sacrifices (Num. xv. 2–13); but from this chapter with vi. 14, and with Num. v. 15, it appears that the oblation might be offered separately, although the reasons given for this by Kalisch need not be admitted. It is also associated with the burnt-offering in the generality of its signification as opposed to the more special offerings which follow. Lange: "It signifies not so much *resignation* as *giving*, or *a return*, in the sense of childlike thankfulness, resignation of the support of life, of the enjoyment of life. Its motive is not through a divine demand as the performance of a duty or a debt, but through an instinctive desire of communion with Jehovah. Hence it is here indeed the soul, נֶפֶשׁ, that brings the sacrifice, not the אָדָם as in the burnt-offering; and in spite of the grammatical equivalence of both expressions, we must not obliterate this distinction." The word מִנְחָה itself originally means a present with which one seeks to obtain the favor of a superior (Gen. xxxii. 21, 22; xliii. 11, 15, etc.); then *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, what is presented to God, a sacrifice. At first it was used alike of the bloody and the unbloody sacrifice (Gen. iv. 3, 4); but under the law it is restricted absolutely to bloodless offerings. The full expression, as in vers. 1 and 4, is קָרְבָּן מִנְחָה, LXX. *δῶρον θυσία*, although often either *δῶρον* or *θυσία* alone. Besides the kinds of oblation mentioned here, there were others, as the shew-bread and the jealousy-offering. With those enumerated in this chapter salt was always to be used (ver. 13) and oil (vers. 1, 4–7, 15); and with those of flour and grain, incense also (vers. 1, 15).

Only a handful of these oblations was to be burnt upon the altar, the rest being eaten by the priests in "a holy place." The oblation of unprepared flour or of flour simply mingled with oil (vii. 10) was the common property of the priests (ver. 3); while that which was cooked belonged to the officiating priest (vii. 9, 10).

"While the bloody sacrifice is to be purified of its unclean portions, the unbloody sacrifice is to be enriched by the addition of oil, incense and salt; *i. e.* the enjoyment of life becomes enriched and preserved clean through spirit and through prayer, and especially through the salt of the covenant—through the hard spiritual discipline which keeps pure the divine fellowship. In its nature the "meat-offering" [oblation] is closely related to the salvation (or peace) offer-

ing; yet the latter has reference to the enjoyment or desire of uncommon prosperity, while the former relates to the enjoyment of usual and quiet existence. The meat-offering culminates in the shew-bread (Ex. xxv. 30; Lev. xxiv. 5)." Lange. "In all these cases the sacred character of the offering was conveyed not only by the admixture of oil, the type of holiness and sanctification, the addition of frankincense, the emblem of devotion, and the use of salt, the agent of preservation, and therefore called 'the salt of the covenant;' but more decidedly still by the rigid prohibition of honey and leaven, representing fermentation and corruption, by the portion devoted to God and burnt in His honor as a 'memorial' to bring the worshipper to His gracious remembrance, and lastly by the injunction to leave to the priests the remainder as most holy." Kalisch.

Three kinds of oblation are here mentioned, the second of which had three varieties: I. Fine flour with frankincense (vers. 1–3); II. Cakes or pastry: (*a*) of unleavened cakes mixed with oil and baked in an oven (ver. 4), or (*b*) of thin cakes, also unleavened, baked and then broken up and oil poured over them (vers. 5, 6), or (*c*) of fine flour boiled in oil (ver. 7); the directions common to all these varieties occupy vers. 8–10, while those concerning all oblations are in vers. 11–13; III. Parched kernels of the first-fruits of grain with frankincense.

I. The first kind of oblation. Vers. 1–3.

Ver. 1. **A soul**=a person, any one of either sex.

Fine flour—סֹלֶת, a word of uncertain derivation, but clearly meaning fine flour, whether as separated from the bran, or as sifted from the coarser particles. The Syr. here renders *puram*, and in Gen. xviii. 6 it is put in apposition with סְאִים קֶמַח. It is probable that this flour was generally of wheat (see Ex. xxix. 2), and the LXX. always translate it σεμίδαλις. The Vulg. has *similia*. סֹלֶת does not occur in connection with the jealousy-oblation of barley, Num. v. 15.

Put frankincense thereto.—The incense was not mixed with the flour and oil, but so added that it might be wholly removed with the "handful" which was taken to be burned with the incense upon the altar. Frankincense was "a costly, sweet-smelling, pale yellow resin, the milky exudation of a shrub, used for sacred fumigations" (Fuerst), and also for purposes of royal luxury (Cant. iii. 6). It is considered to have been a product of Southwestern Arabia. Its use in the oblations presented with the animal sacrifices must have been important. Maimonides (*More Neboch.*, lib. III., c. 46): *Elegitque ad eam thus, propter bonitatem odoris fumi ipsius in illis locis, ubi fœtor est ex carnibus combustis.*

Ver. 2. **And he shall take.**—The A. V. like the Heb. leaves the antecedent of the pronoun somewhat uncertain; but the Targ. Onkelos and the Vulg. are undoubtedly right in referring it to the priest, see vi. 15, and comp. also v. 12. The transfer of the handful from the offerer to the priest who was to burn it would have been inconvenient.

Handful.—Plainly what the hand could hold, and not, as the Rabbins have it, with the thumb and little finger closed, leaving three fingers open.

Memorial.—אַזְכָּרָה, applied only to that part of the oblation which was burnt upon the altar (vers. 9, 16; vi. 15), to the corresponding part of the sin-offering of flour (v. 12), of the jealousy-offering (Num. v. 26), and also to the frankincense placed upon the shew-bread (xxiv. 7), which last was also burnt upon the altar. The LXX. render by *μνημόσυνον*, and the figurative application of that word to the prayers and alms of Cornelius (Acts x. 4) throws light upon the significance of the oblation.

An offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the Lord.—The same expression as is applied to the burnt-offering, i. 9, 13, 17.

Ver. 3. **And the remnant,** *etc.*—So far as the offerer was concerned, the oblation was as wholly given to the Lord as the burnt-offering; nothing of it was restored to him. There was a difference in the method by which it was given: the burnt-offering was wholly burned except the skin, which was given to the priest; the oblation had only an handful burned, together with all the incense, and the bulk of it was consumed by the priests.

A thing most holy.—קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, lit. *holy of holies.* This term is applied to all sacrificial gifts which were wholly devoted to God, yet of which a part was given to Him by being given to His priests. It is not applied to the burnt-offerings, nor to the priestly oblations (vi. 19-23), nor to any other sacrifices which were wholly consumed upon the altar. All sacrifices were *holy*, and the phrase *most holy* is not to mark those to which it is applied as holier than the others; but is used only in regard to those which, having been wholly devoted, might possibly be perverted to other uses. Thus it is used of the oblations (vers. 3, 10; vi. 17; x. 12) of such of the sin and trespass-offerings as were not burned without the camp (vi. 25, 29; vii. 1, 6; x. 17; xiv. 13; Num. xviii. 9), and of the shew-bread (xxiv. 9). Its use is similar when applied to other things than sacrifices; thus, Ex. xl. 10, it is used of the altar in contradistinction to the tabernacle which is called *holy* (ver. 9), because the altar was thus to be guarded from the touch of the people, while there was no danger in regard to the tabernacle proper, since they were forbidden to enter it at all (comp. Ex. xxix. 37); so the term is applied to the sacred incense (Ex. xxx. 36), and to all objects devoted by vow, whether man or beast or field (xxvii. 28). The parts of all "most holy" sacrifices which were not placed upon the altar must be eaten by the priests themselves in "a holy place" (vi. 26; vii. 6; x. 17, etc.); and this "holy place"—not the sanctuary itself—is more particularly described (vi. 26) as "in the court of the tabernacle of the congregation," and "beside the altar" (x. 12). Whereas the priests' portion of other sacrifices might be eaten with their families in any "clean place" (x. 14).

II. The second kind of oblation. Vers. 4-13. This included several varieties of cakes or pastry all prepared from fine flour and with oil, but without frankincense.

(*a*) The first variety, ver. 4.

Ver. 4. **Baken in the oven.**—תַּנּוּר is an oven of any kind, but must here mean a portable oven, or rather a large earthen pot or jar, such as is still in use in the East for baking cakes, such as is mentioned in xi. 35 as capable of being broken; this was heated by a fire inside.

Cakes.—חַלּוֹת from חָלַל=to be perforated. A thick kind of cake pierced with holes after the fashion of our bakers' biscuit. These were mixed up with oil before baking.

Wafers—from רָקַק=*to beat or spread out thin*, This denotes a kind of cake well described by *wafer*. It is often cooked by the Arabs on the outside of the same vessel in which the חַלּוֹת are baked at the same time. The oil was applied to these after they were baked.

(*b*) The second variety, vers. 5, 6.

Ver. 5. **In a pan.**—עַל־הַמַּחֲבַת. Authorities differ as to whether this is to be understood as in the text of the A. V. of a frying-pan, or as in the margin of a flat plate. The LXX. render *τήγανον* which seems to be equally perpetuated in the iron frying-pans of the Cabyles of Africa, and the earthen plates of the Bedouins of the East, both being called *tajen*. The distinction of this variety of oblation from the former will be more marked if we may understand it of *fried* cakes, according to the translation of the A. V. in 1 Chron. xxiii. 29. This was both to be made up with oil, and to have oil poured on it after it was cooked and broken into pieces.

(*c*) The third variety, ver. 7.

Ver. 7. **Boiled in a pot.**—This is another variety made up with oil and boiled, perhaps also boiled in oil. Lange notes that with each successive advance in the form of the oblation "the addition of the oil seems to rise, as if the varying grade of spiritual life was distinguished by the consecration of life's enjoyment. (See Keil, Knobel, 363.) But throughout the oil of the Spirit is the peculiar or appropriate vital essence of the offering, especially in the burnt-offering and the thank-offering, and above all in the sacrifice of the priests."

Directions common to both these varieties of oblation. Vers. 8-10. These scarcely differ from the directions in vers. 2, 3, except in the omission of incense which was not used with the cooked oblation. The הָרִים כֹּן in ver. 9 has the same sense with the קָמַץ כֹּן of ver. 2 (comp. iii. 3 with iv. 8, 31, 35; and iv. 10 with iv. 31, 35), and means simply to lift off the part to be burned. It does not denote, as the Rabbins and others assert, any special waving ceremony.

Vers. 11-13. General directions concerning all oblations.

Ye shall burn no leaven, nor any honey.—These were strictly prohibited as offerings to be laid upon the altar, but not for those offered to God by being given to His priests; thus they are allowed in ver. 12. Leavened bread is also required in the peace-offering to be used as a heave-offering (vii. 13, 14), and in the Pentecostal loaves to be waved before the Lord (xxiii. 17, 20), and honey is expressly enumerated among the first-fruits offered under Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi. 5). The reason for the exclusion of these from the altar was undoubtedly their fermenting property (for honey was anciently used in the preparation of vinegar, Plin. Nat. Hist. xi. 15; xxi. 48); fermentation has ever been recognized "as an apt symbol of the working of corruption in the human heart" (Clark) both in Scripture (Luke xii. 1; 1 Cor. v. 8; Gal. v. 9), and among the ancients generally (Aul. Gell. Noct. Att. x. 15), and hence was unsuitable for the altar of Jehovah, although as abundantly shown by Bochart (*Hieroz.* Ed. Rosen. III., p. 394 sq.) continually offered to the heathen deities. Honey was also by the ancient interpreters generally connected with the *deliciæ carnis* so destructive of the spiritual life. "The leaven signifies an incongruous fellowship with the world, easily becoming contagious, which must be excluded from the priestly fellowship with Jehovah. The honey, on the other hand, signified in contrast with the leaven, the dainty enjoyment of children, or especially infants (Isa. vii. 15), and was no food for the communion of priestly *men* with Jehovah." Lange.

Ver. 12. **As an offering.**—The sense is plainly that while leaven, *i. e.* anything made with leaven, and honey might not be burned upon the altar, they were yet allowable as offerings of first-fruits to be consumed by the priests.

Ver. 13. This verse gives directions applicable to all oblations, and in fact to all sacrifices. **The salt of the covenant of thy God.**—A covenant of salt is a perpetual covenant, Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 5; and this expression is said to be still in use among the Arabs at this day. Salt in its unalterable and preserving property is the opposite of leaven and of honey. Its symbolical meaning is therefore plain; the purifying and preserving principle must never be wanting from any offering made in covenant-relation with God.

With all thine offerings.—From the connection of this clause it might, with Knobel, be taken as applicable only to oblations; but as salt was used with all offerings (Ezek. xliii. 24: Mark ix. 49), not only among the Hebrews, but other nations also (Plin. Nat. Hist. xxxi. 41 *in sacris . . . nulla conficiuntur sine mola salsa*), and as on account of this universally recognized usage no other direction is anywhere given about it in the law, it seems better to take the words as a parenthetical clause meant to apply to all offerings of every kind.

III. The third kind of oblation. Vers. 14-16. This kind of oblation is separated from the others probably because it was not like them offered in connection with the bloody sacrifices, but by itself, like the same kind of offering mentioned in Num. xviii. 12, 13. That offering, however, was obligatory, while this was voluntary. Lange, however, considers that "this direction looks back to ver. 12, completing it. It is true that the leavened loaves of the first-fruits might

not be brought to the sacrificial fire; but it is not on that account to be said that in general the first-fruits were not to be offered. Accordingly the form is now prescribed." These precepts are of course to be understood of private and voluntary oblations of first-fruits; both the time (on the morrow after the Passover-Sabbath, xxiii. 11) and the material (barley—for this only was ripe at that time) of the public and required oblation grain were prescribed.

Ver. 14. **Green ears of grain.**—Ears freshly gathered of the maturing grain scarcely yet quite ripe. Stalks of wheat with the ears, gathered before they are entirely ripe, roasted by the fire, and the kernels of grain then beaten out, is still a favorite food in the East.

Vers. 15, 16. **Oil and frankincense** were to be added, and the oblation treated as that in vers. 2, 3.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. As the burnt-offerings were of such domestic animals as were used for food, and yet not from every kind of them; so the oblations were of certain kinds of farinaceous food in common use—not indeed of all kinds, but of a sufficient variety to place the material of the offering always within easy reach. Both kinds of offerings, which were entirely voluntary, were thus made easily accessible to the people, and they were taught that the things of the daily life were to be sanctified by offerings to God. As the *perfect* animal was required for the burnt-offering, so the *fine* flour was demanded for the oblation; that which is given to God is to be of the best man has.

II. That which is once absolutely given to God may not afterwards be turned aside to any other use. However voluntary the gift, when it has once been stamped "most holy," it belongs to Him alone. The principle is recognized in the N. T. in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. Yet what is given to God must often, as in the oblation, be largely consumed by those who minister on His behalf, and by secondary instrumentalities generally. This is recognized by St. Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14, and must necessarily be true of the great mass of the gifts in the Christian Church given to God for the upholding and advancement of His kingdom on earth.

III. In the exclusion from the oblation of all ferment and the requirement of the salt of purity and preservation is plainly taught that approach to God must be free from contamination of "the leaven of hypocrisy," and must have in it both purity and steadfastness.

IV. In the oblation, recognizing as a whole that man gives back to God of that which God has given to him, the use of the oil seems to have a more special significance. As an article of food it meant also what was meant by the fine flour; but inasmuch as oil is constantly in Scripture the emblem of Divine grace given through the Spirit, it was perhaps intended by its use in the oblation to signify also the acknowledgment that spiritual gifts are from God and belong to Him.

V. Much of the ritual of the oblation is applied in the N. T. to Christian duties and affections, sometimes in what is common to this with other offerings, sometimes in what belonged to this alone. Several such passages have already been pointed out; others may be added: Matt. xvi. 6, Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees; Mark ix. 49, 50, Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt. . . . . Have salt in yourselves, and have peace one with another; 1 Cor. v. 7, 8; Col. iv. 6, Let your speech be alway with grace, seasoned with salt; Heb. xiii. 15, through Christ, Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The oblation to God, though unbloody and among the least of the sacrifices, must still be the best of its kind, of *fine flour*. It must have upon it the oil of an act of the Spirit, and the sweet frankincense of prayer. That it may be truly a gift to God, and acceptable, it is only necessary that a mere handful of it be actually burned upon His altar; the rest is still a gift to Him, although consumed by those who minister in His service. "It is joined with the burnt-offering like blessing with faithful discharge of duty." Lange.

Every variety of food, fit for the altar, must be sanctified by an oblation. We ever ask: "Give us this day our daily bread," and receiving it, we are called upon to acknowledge the Giver by giving to Him an offering of that which is His own. Even the leaven and the honey, which, from their fermenting properties, may not go upon the altar, may yet be offered as first-fruits. There is none of God's gifts which we may use ourselves, with which we may not show our gratitude to the Giver.

In the worship of God "we may not adopt our own inventions, though they may be sweet and delicious as honey to our own palates. . . . Honey is good in its proper place, and heaven itself is typified by 'a land flowing with milk and honey' (Ex. iii. 8; xiii. 5); but if God forbids it, we must abstain from it, or we shall not come to that heavenly Canaan." Wordsworth.

That seasoning of salt which the apostle requires for our conversation (Col. iv. 6), may not be wanting from our gifts to God. They are not to be insipid, but having "that freshness and vital briskness which characterizes the Spirit's presence and work." Alford.

Of first-fruits especially is an oblation to be brought. Not only should we give to God as He blesses us all along; but especially with each new harvest received from His bounty should a first portion be laid aside for His service.

C.—PEACE-OFFERINGS.

CHAP. III. 1–17.

1 AND if his oblation [offering[1]] *be* a sacrifice of peace-offering, if he offer *it* of the
herd; whether *it be* a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the
2 LORD. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it *at* the
door of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the[2]] congregation: and Aaron's sons the priests
3 shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And he shall offer of the
sacrifice of the peace-offering an offering made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that
4 covereth the inwards, and all the fat that *is* upon the inwards, and the two kidneys,
and the fat that *is* on them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver,
5 with [on[3]] the kidneys, it shall he take away. And Aaron's sons[4] shall burn it on
the altar upon the burnt-sacrifice, which *is* upon the wood that *is* on the fire: *it is*
an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

6 And if his offering for a sacrifice of peace-offering unto the LORD *be* of the flock;
7 male or female, he shall offer it without blemish. If he offer a lamb [sheep[5]] for
8 his offering, then shall he offer it before the LORD. And he shall lay his hand
upon the head of his offering, and kill it before[6] the tabernacle of the [*om.* the[2]]
congregation: and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle the blood thereof round about upon
9 the altar. And he shall offer of the sacrifice of the peace-offering an offering made
by fire unto the LORD; the fat thereof, *and* the whole rump [fat tail[7]], it shall he
take off hard by the back-bone: and the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the
10 fat that *is* upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them,
which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with [on[3]] the kidneys, it shall
11 he take away. And the priest shall burn it upon the altar: *it is* the food of the
offering made by fire[8] unto the LORD.

12, 13 And if his offering *be* a goat, then he shall offer it before the Lord. And he
shall lay his hand upon the head of it, and kill it before the tabernacle of the [*om.*
the[2]] congregation: and the sons of Aaron shall sprinkle the blood thereof upon
14 the altar round about. And he shall offer thereof his offering, *even* an offering
made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that
15 *is* upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is*
by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with [on[3]] the kidneys, it shall he take
16 away. And the priest shall burn them upon the altar: *it is* the food of the offering made by fire for a sweet savour: all the fat *is* the LORD's [as food of an offer-

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. קָרְבָּן=offering, as in ch. ii.

[2] Ver. 2. See on i. 3, Text. Note [3].

[3] Ver. 4. עַל must here be translated *on*, not *with*, since the kidneys have just been mentioned.

[4] Ver. 5. The Sam., LXX. and one MS. add *the priests*. So also the LXX. and one MS. in ver. 8, and the Sam. and LXX. in ver. 13.

[5] Ver. 7. כֶּבֶשׂ=כֶּבֶשׂ, according to Bochart (*Hieroz.* I. 33), a sheep of intermediate age between the טָלֶה=lamb and the אַיִל of three years old. It is, however, often applied to the sheep of one year in which case the age is mentioned, as xiv. 10; Num. vii. 15, 17, 21, etc. In Prov. xxvii. 26 it is described as yielding wool. In the A. V. the form כֶּבֶשׂ is uniformly rendered *lamb*, except in Ex. xii. 5, while the other form is translated *sheep* nine times, and *lamb* four times. There is no ground for this distinction.

[6] Ver. 8. The locality for killing the victim is made more definite by the insertion in one MS. and in the Syr.: "before the Lord at the door of." The LXX. makes the same insertion in ver. 13.

[7] Ver. 9. אַלְיָה, according to all interpreters the fat tail of the *ovis laticaudata*, a variety common in Arabia and Syria, but in modern Palestine said to be the only variety. The tail is described as of rich marrowy fat, of the width of the hind quarters, and often trailing on the ground. The word occurs only in this connection (Ex. xxix. 22; Lev. vii. 3; viii. 25; ix. 19), and is rendered by all the ancient versions, except the LXX. (ὀσφύς), *tail*. So also Jos. Ant. iii. 9, 2.

[8] Ver. 11. The sense is expressed by the addition in 2 MSS. and in the LXX. of the words from i. 9, 13, 17, רֵיחַ-נִיחוֹחַ (=a sweet-smelling savor.)

17 ing made by fire for a sweet savour, *shall* all the fat *be* the LORD'S[9]. *It shall be* a perpetual statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, that ye eat neither fat nor blood.

[9] Ver. 16. The A. V. seems unnecessarily complicated, as there are but two clauses in this verse. After "savour" the Sam., LXX., and some MSS. add "to the Lord."

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The peace-offering, like the offerings of the preceding chapters, is spoken of as already in common use, and the law is given for its proper regulation. The offerings of this, as of the previous chapters, were voluntary. The peace-offering differed from the oblation in being animal, and from the burnt-offering in not being wholly consumed, but after a small portion had been burned, and a portion given to the priest, the remainder reverted to the offerer for a sacrificial meal (vii. 11-21); a further difference is in that the burnt-offerings were only male, the peace-offerings either male or female; and still further, doves were not allowed in the peace-offerings, because they were too small for the necessary division, and for the sacrificial feast.

The full form זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים used here, is nearly always employed in Leviticus; but the peace-offering is probably intended by the simple זֶבַח of xxiii. 37 (vii. 16, 17 does not, and xvii. 8 may not mean peace-offering), and it certainly is by שְׁלָמִים in ix. 22. The latter, as the determining word, is frequently used elsewhere alone, as Ex. xx. 24; xxxii. 6; Deut. xxvii. 7; Josh. viii. 31, *etc.* The word is variously derived and has various shades of signification attached to it: (1) *Thank-offering*, Gesenius, Fürst, Luther, Rosenmüller, Winer, Bähr, *etc.*, *θυσία χαριστηρία*, Jos. Ant. iii. 9, 2; (2) Meat-offering, Zunz; (3) *Salvation-offering*, *σωτήριον*, LXX. most frequently (*i. e.* in the Pent., Josh., Judges, Chron., Ezra, Amos), PHILO; (4) *Peace-offering*, *εἰρηνικός*, LXX. (in Samuel, Kings, Prov.), Aq., Sym., Theod., Vulg., A. V. The last two senses are very similar; the first seems less appropriate, partly because the strictly *thank-offering* appears as a special variety of this more general class (vii. 11, 12); partly because the שְׁלָמִים were offered not only in thanks for benefits received, but also in times of distress and in supplication for the divine help (Judg. xx. 26; xxi. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 9; 2 Sam. xxiv. 25). Outram says: *Sacrificia salutaria in sacris literis shelamim dicta, ut quæ semper de rebus prosperis fieri solerent, impetratis utique aut impetrandis.* Lange brings together the several meanings in the name *Heilsopfer*, salvation or saving offering "in the common sense of blessing or prosperity-offering." In English the already accepted *peace-offering* seems to express sufficiently the same sense, and is therefore retained. The law (vii. 12-16) distinguishes three kinds of peace-offerings—thanksgiving, vow and free-will offerings; the only difference in their ritual being in the length of time during which their flesh might be eaten.

The peace-offerings are not called "most holy" like the oblation, but only "holy," and the priests' portion might be eaten by their families in any "clean place" (vii. 31 with x. 14; xxiii. 20). The portion which reverted to the offerer to be eaten as a sacrificial feast might be partaken of only by those who were legally "clean" (vii. 20, 21). The peace-offerings were prescribed on a variety of occasions, and as they were the necessary offerings of sacrificial feasts, and hence of all solemn national rejoicings, they were the most common of all sacrifices. From Num. xv. it appears that, like the burnt-offering, they were always accompanied by the meat and the drink-offering.—Lange: "The peace-offering refers to prosperity as Jehovah's free gift in past, present, and future. As regards the past, it is a simple praise and thank-offering (an Eben Ezer, Amos v. 22). In reference to a happy present, it is a contentment, joy, or feast-offering. As it relates to a future to be realized, to an experience of salvation yet to come, to a deliverance or an exhibition of mercy that is prayed for with a vow, it is a votive offering. The prescriptions in regard to the various kinds are different. Here it is said, that the animal to be slain may be either male or female, only it must be without blemish. In ch. vii. 15 sq. nothing of the praise-offering might be left over until the next day, whereas the vow, or free-will offering might be eaten also on the next day, but not on the third day." Lange then points out that in the case of those vow, or free-will offerings which were to be burnt-offerings, a male was required, xxii. 19, without blemish. "Even an abnormal formation of the victim, too long or too short legs of the animal [vii. 22, 23] was enough to make it unsuitable for the vow-offering, but still not for the free-will offering. So every kind of prosperity was to be hallowed to the Lord."*

Sacrificial feasts were at least as old as the time of Jacob (Gen. xxxi. 54), and became common among all nations; but the distinctive name of peace-offering first appears when Moses came down with the law from Mt. Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 5). The thing signified, however, must have been already familiar to the people, for the word recurs in connection with the idolatrous sacrifice of Aaron when Moses had again gone up into the Mount (Ex. xxxii. 6).

Two kinds of victims were allowable: of the "herd," or of the "flock."

Vers. 1–5. The peace-offering of the herd, *i. e.* a bullock or a cow.

* In regard to the question whether the peace-offering embraces also the supplicatory offering, Lange says: "It is understood that the vows themselves were supplications, from which the accompanying offering might also be called a supplicatory offering; but a peculiar supplicatory offering to strengthen the supplication would have been prejudicial to the freedom of the divine hearing. It shows a fine distinction that the free praise and thank-offerings (*Thoda*), which were preceded by no vows, were exalted above the vow-offerings and free-will offerings, inasmuch as these latter might be accompanied by a selfish feeling."

Ver. 1. The victim both in this and in the other kind (ver. 6) might be of either sex. According to Herodotus, this was directly contrary to the Egyptian law, which forbade offering the female in sacrifice: *θηλείας οὐ σφι ἔξεστι θύειν* (ii. 41). As in the case of other offerings, the victim must be "without blemish." There was ordinarily no restriction of age, although in some special cases yearling lambs are mentioned (xxiii. 19; Num. vii. 17).

Ver. 2. The laying on of the offerer's hand and the sprinkling of the blood by the priest are the same as in the case of the burnt-offering; hence no signification can be attached to these acts in the one case which will not apply in the other also, except of course in so far as an act of essentially the same meaning might be somewhat modified by its connections.

Vers. 3, 4. There were four parts to be burned upon the altar: (1) **the fat that covereth the inwards**, *i. e.* the large net, *omentum*, Jos. iii. 9, 2, *ἐπίπλους*, caul, or adipose membrane found in mammals attached to the stomach and spreading over the bowels, and which in the ruminants abounds with fat; (2) **all the fat which is upon the inwards**, *i. e.* the fat attached to the intestines, and which could be peeled off; (3) **the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the flanks**, or loins, *i. e.* the kidneys and all the fat connected with them; the kidneys are the only thing to be burned except the fat; (4) the smaller net, *omentum minus*, or **caul above the liver**, which stretches on one side to the region of the kidneys, hence **on the kidneys**, עַל=by them, not *with* them, they having been just before mentioned. The word יֹתֶרֶת occurs only in Ex. (twice) and Lev. (nine times) always in connection with כָּבֵד=the liver; it is described as *above* or *upon* the liver, and hence is not to be understood, as has often been done, of the liver itself, or of a part of it. These four include all the separable fat in the inside of the animal (and in addition to these was the fat tail in the case of the sheep), so that, ver. 16, they are called "all the fat," so also iv. 8, 19, 26, 31, 35; vii. 3.

Ver. 5. **Aaron's sons shall burn.**—The burning on the altar, and the sprinkling of the blood (ver. 2), being the acts by which the sacrifice was especially offered to God, were always and in all sacrifices the priestly function.

Upon the burnt sacrifice.—This rendering is quite correct, and is in accordance with the ancient versions. The sense given by Knobel "according to" or "in the manner of the burnt-offering" is inadmissible. עַל may sometimes bear this sense (Ex. xii. 51; Ps. cx. 4); but it is rare, and not likely to be the meaning here. As a matter of fact, peace-offerings ordinarily followed especial burnt-offerings, and always the daily burnt-offering, which would so seldom have been entirely consumed when the peace-offering was offered, that the fat might naturally be described as placed *upon* it.

Vers. 6-16. The peace-offerings of sheep or goats.

The ritual for the second kind of peace-offering is the same as for the first; it is repeated in case the victim should be a sheep (vers. 6-11), and in case it should be a goat (vers. 12-16). Only in the case of the sheep, on the principle of burning all the separable fat, the tail (see Textual, ver. 9) must also be laid upon the altar.

Ver. 11. (Comp. ver. 16.) **The food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord.**—This is a common expression applied to sacrifices generally ("my bread," Num. xxviii. 2; "Bread of God," ch. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22; xxii. 25); yet especially mentioned only in connection with the peace-offerings. It is used only of the portions of the victim burned upon the altar, and is expressly distinguished from the portion eaten by the priests (xxi. 22). By a natural figure, the whole victim being food, the part of it given to Jehovah by burning upon the altar is called the food of Jehovah, and shows the communion between Him and the worshipper brought about by the sacrifice. It is not necessary, however, to realize this figure by attributing to the Hebrews the thought—belonging to the later heathen—that God actually required food; such a notion was foreign to their whole theology.

Ver. 16. **All the fat**—*i. e.*, all that has been enumerated—all the separable fat of the victim.

Ver. 17. **Throughout all your dwellings.**—This applies to the life in the wilderness when all sacrificial animals slain for food were required to be offered as peace-offerings before the Lord (xvii. 3-7); whether it applies also to the subsequent life in the land of promise, when this restriction was to be removed (Deut. xii. 15; xiv. 22, 23; xv. 22, 23), has been much debated. In the passages removing that restriction, mention is made only of the blood which must be poured out, and in the Song of Moses (Deut. xxxii. 14), the "fat of lambs" is especially mentioned among the blessings to be enjoyed.

Ye shall eat neither fat nor blood.—The prohibition of the separable fat (חֵלֶב in contradistinction to the מֻשְׁמָן or שֻׁמָּן the fat mixed with the flesh which might be eaten, Neh. viii. 10) for food springs immediately from the fact that it was especially consecrated to God, and therefore not to be used by man. If we seek the reason of this consecration it is not to be sought on hygienic grounds (Rosenmüller), but rather in its connection with the animal economy. As blood is described as "the life" of the animal, so is the fat a stored-up source of life, drawn upon for sustaining life whenever, in deficiency of food or other exigency, it is required. It thus stands more nearly related in function to the blood, and became naturally the appropriate portion for the altar. Its proper development was also a mark of perfection in the animal. It is further to be borne in mind that the fat was considered the choice portion, and hence the word was figuratively used of excellence (Gen. xxvii. 28; xlv. 18, *etc.*) and thus the fat, as the best, was reserved for God's portion. The prohibition is repeated with still stronger emphasis, vii. 23-25. but with the exception that the fat of animals dying of themselves may be applied to other uses (ver. 24). It has always been under-

stood by the Jews that the prohibition respects only the fat of animals that might be offered in sacrifice. Comp. vii. 23.

Nothing is here said of the disposal of the flesh of the victim, the law of this being given in detail, vii. 11-36.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. As all vegetable food was sanctified by the oblation, so all animal food was by the peace offering. In the wilderness this was literally carried out by the presenting of all animals fit for sacrifice as offerings, sprinkling their blood and burning their fat upon the altar; later, when in Palestine this became impossible on account of the distances, the idea was kept up in the prohibition of the blood for food. The general principle thus expressed for all time is that God's gifts to man are to be acknowledged as from Him, and due return made to Him, or otherwise they are profaned.

II. In the expression "Food of the LORD," although figurative, we recognize the idea of communion between God and man, expressed by a part of the sacrifice burned on the altar, and called by this name, while another part was eaten by the offerer at the sacrificial feast. Similarly the Eucharist is spoken of in 1 Cor. x. 21 as the "Lord's table." In this respect the peace-offering under the old dispensation signified the same thing as the Eucharist under the new—the communion of the devout worshipper with God. It was eminently a feast of love towards God and man; the worshipper communicated with God by feasting on the sacrifice offered to Him, and by the portion eaten by the priests as His representatives, and with man by feasting with his friends on the remainder. It is happily described by Wordsworth as "an Eucharist coupled with an offertory."

III. All sacrifices were necessarily typical of Christ, and each of them had in this respect its peculiar significance; with the peace-offering He is especially connected by the prophecy of Isaiah (liii. 5) "the chastisement of our peace was upon Him," and by the frequent application of this word to Him and to His sacrifice in the New Testament, (Rom. v. 1; Eph. ii. 14-16; Col. i. 20, *etc.*).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"The Peace-offering is the expression of the feeling that man might receive or ask only a pure prosperity from God, and might offer it to Him again." Lange. In this offering "God, the Master and Judge, was merged in God, the Benefactor and Rescuer." Kalisch. In the feasting of the offerer with his friends upon the flesh of the sacrifice was expressed clearly the idea of communion with God; yet even in this offering, the blood must be sprinkled upon the altar;—in the nearest approach of sinful man to God, there must still be propitiation.

In the peace-offering any sacrificial animal, of either sex, and of any age was allowable; God gives man the largest latitude of choice in the ways of expressing his gratitude. He also sanctifies as a means of communion with Him whatever He has appointed as the means of approaching Him in any way. The Christian may commune with God in work, in prayer, in sacraments, in study of His word.

In this sacrifice the fat was burnt upon the altar, and certain choice parts given to the priests to be eaten with their families; so in our thanksgivings, first let the Giver of all good be recognized, and the best of all be given back to Him; and then let a portion be given also to those who maintain His service, that the main part which remains may be enjoyed by us with a holy joy.

The sacrifice for sin (see ch. iv.) was limited to that which was prescribed, nothing more was allowed; the peace-offerings might be unlimited in number and in value: so man now may seek forgiveness only in the way God has provided,—he can add nothing to its efficacy; but to the expression of his thankfulness, and to his desire for communion with God, no bounds are set. He may go as far as he can, and his offerings will be looked upon with approbation as "a sweet savor unto the LORD."

The feast upon the sacrifice of peace-offerings might include all the members of the offerer's family. Thus was the joyous family feast, like every other human relation and condition, brought by the Levitical law into relation with duties to God, and sanctified by His blessing and by symbolical communion with Him.

A true sacrifice of praise is offered by those who glorify God in their lives. This constitutes the Christian peace-offering of communion with God in its highest form—that of thanksgiving for His inestimable benefits showed forth in a sincere obedience to His commands. Origen.

D.—SIN OFFERINGS.

CHAPTERS IV. 1–35—V. 1–13.

1, 2 AND the LORD, spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a soul shall sin through ignorance [inadvertence[1]] against any of the

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. בִּשְׁגָגָה from שָׁגַג = שָׁגָה = שָׁגָא = *to totter to and fro, to wander, to go wrong.* It includes not only sinning unawares, through ignorance (vers. 13, 22, 27; v. 17), or carelessness, and want of consideration (v. 1, 4); but also unintentional sins (like that of manslaughter without malice, Num. xxxv. 11, 15, 22), and therefore sins arising from human infirmity in contradistinction to intentional and defiant sins—sins "with a high hand"—for which no sacrifice was allow-

commandments of the LORD *concerning things* which ought not to be done, and shall do [omit against[2]] any of them:

3 If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people [to the guilt of the people[3]]; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young
4 bullock without blemish unto the LORD for a sin offering. And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation before the LORD; and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before
5 the LORD. And the priest that is anointed[4] shall take of the bullock's blood, and
6 bring it to the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation: and the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the LORD, be-
7 fore the vail of the sanctuary. And the priest shall put *some* of the blood[5] upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the LORD, which *is* in the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation; and shall pour all the [*other*] blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of the burnt offering, which *is at* the door of the taber-
8 nacle of the [*omit* the] congregation. And he shall take off from it all the fat of the bullock for the sin offering; the fat that covereth the[6] inwards, and all the fat
9 that *is* upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul above the liver, with [on[8a]] the kidneys, it shall he
10 take away, as it was taken off from the bullock of the sacrifice of peace offerings; 11 and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt offering. And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards,
12 and his dung, even the whole bullock shall he[7] carry forth without the camp unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.

13 And if the whole congregation[8] of Israel sin [err[9]] through ignorance [inadvertence[1]], and the thing be hid[10] from the eyes of the assembly,[3] and they have done *somewhat against* any of the commandments of the LORD *concerning things* which
14 should not be done, and are guilty; when the sin, which they have sinned against it, is known, then the congregation shall offer a young bullock[11] for the sin [a sin offering[12]] and bring him before the[13] tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation.

able (Num. xv. 27-31). The LXX. has ἀκουσίως, the Targ. Onk. (also Ben Uz. and Jerus.) בִּשְׁלִי = *through error*, so also the Syr. The old Italic has *imprudenter*. Aquila reads *ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ*, and it was perhaps by a literal translation of this that the Vulg. came to read *per ignorantiam*, which has been perpetuated in the A. V.; but in Hellenistic Greek ἀγνοία and ἀγνοήμα (Heb. ix. 7) bear rather the sense given above. See Schleus. Lex. in LXX. *Through going astray* might better express the meaning, except that it does not sufficiently bring out the distinction as in the *animus* of the sinner.

[2] Ver. 2. מֵאַחַת מִיהוָה. The A. V. has supplied *against*, as in the former clause, where the construction is the same; but there it is required, and here worse than useless to the sense. It should be omitted as in nearly all the ancient versions. The מִן in both clauses is to be taken partitively.

[3] Ver. 3. לְאַשְׁמַת Prop. inf. const. Kal., and there used as a noun = *to bring guilt upon*. So most of the ancient versions and the modern expositors generally.

[4] Ver. 5. To *anointed* the LXX. and Sam. Vers. add *whose hand is consecrated*. The Sam. text has a similar addition.

[5] Ver. 7. The Sam. and 8 MSS. prefix the article to דָּם, while the Sam., 3 MSS., and Vulg., omit *the bullock*.

[6] Ver. 8. עַל־הַקֶּרֶב. This is translated in the A. V. and in the ancient versions as if it were אֵת־ה״ as in iii. 14. So it must be translated, and such is actually the reading in the Sam. and many MSS.

[7] Ver. 12. The Sam. and LXX. here have the plural. Of course the high-priest did not do this with his own hands, but is said to do that which he caused to be done, according to common usage of all languages.

[8a] Ver. 9. On. See iii. 4, Textual Note [3].

[8] Ver. 13. כָּל־עֲדַת (*congregation*) קָהָל (*assembly*) the two words used here, and מוֹעֵד Num. xvi. 2 and freq. have no difference in signification which can be recognized in translation. They are used in apposition.

[9] Ver. 13. שָׁגְגָה. In the A. V. *sin* always in Lev. is the translation of חַטָּאת. This being the only exception, should be changed.

[10] Ver. 13. נֶעְלַם has *dagesh* in the ל here and in v. 2, 4. According to Delitzsch it is an old rule of pointing "that every consonant which followed a syllable terminating with a guttural should be pointed with *dagesh*, if the guttural was to be read with a quiescent *sheva* and not with *chateph*." Comp. וַיֹּאכַל Gen. xlvi. 29; Ex. xiv. 6, תַּעֲלִים (according to some copies) Ps. x. 1.

[11] Ver. 14. The Sam. and LXX. here add the "without blemish" so frequently expressed, and always to be understood.

[12] Ver. 14. לְחַטָּאת. The word is used in both senses—a sin, and a sin-offering. The context requires the latter here. It has no article.

[13] Ver. 14. The LXX. and Vulg. add *the door of*, which is implied.

15 And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the LORD: and the bullock shall be killed [one shall kill the bullock[14]]
16 before the LORD. And the priest that is anointed shall bring of the bullock's blood
17 to the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation: and the priest shall dip his finger *in some* of the blood, and sprinkle *it*[15] seven times before the LORD, *even* before the
18 vail. And he shall put *some* of the blood upon the horns of the altar[16] which *is* before the LORD, that *is* in the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation, and shall pour out all the [*other*] blood at the bottom of the altar of the burnt offering, which
19 *is at* the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation. And he shall take
20 all his fat from him, and burn *it* upon the altar. And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for a [the[17]] sin offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them.
21 And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn him as he burned the first bullock: it[18] *is* a sin offering for the congregation.

22 When a ruler [prince[19]] hath sinned, and done *somewhat* through ignorance [inadvertence[1]] *against* any of the commandments of the Lord his God *concerning*
23 *things* which should not be done, and is guilty; or if [if perhaps[20]] his sin, wherein he hath sinned, come to his knowledge; he shall bring his offering, a kid [a buck[21]]
24 of the goats, a male without blemish: and he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, and kill[22] it in the place where they kill the burnt offering before the
25 LORD: it *is* a sin-offering. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall
26 pour out[23] his blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt offering. And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace offerings: and the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.

27 And if any one of the common people [any soul of the people of the land[24]] sin through ignorance [inadvertence[1]] while he doeth *somewhat against* any of the command-
28 ments of the LORD *concerning things* which ought not to be done, and be guilty; or if [if perhaps[20]] his sin, which he hath sinned, come to his knowledge: then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats [a she-goat[25]] a female without blemish, for his
29 sin which he hath sinned. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin
30 offering, and slay the sin offering in the place of the burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood thereof with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the [*other*] blood thereof at the

[14] Ver. 15. The subject of שָׁחַט is one of the elders.

[15] Ver. 17. The ellipsis supplied by *it* in the A. V. is filled out in the Sam., in one MS., and in the Syr., by "of the blood," comp. ver. 6. Several other words are filled out in the same version in the following verses from the preceding paragraph.

[16] Ver. 18. The Sam. and LXX. unnecessarily specify "altar of incense."

[17] Ver. 20. The article of the original should be retained as the reference is to the sin-offering of the high-priest.

[18] Ver. 21. The Sam. and many MSS. have here again the later feminine form הִיא.

[19] Ver. 22. נָשִׂיא. This word variously rendered in the A. V. *captain, chief, governor, prince,* and *ruler,* occurs in Lev. only here, but very frequently in Num., where it is translated *captain* in ch. ii. (12 times), *chief* in chs. iii., iv. (5 times), once *ruler,* xiii. 2, and *prince* throughout the rest of the book (42 times) as well as throughout Gen. and Josh. In Ex. it occurs four times uniformly translated *ruler.* In nearly all these places it refers to persons of substantially the same rank, and it would be better therefore that its translation should be uniform. It means literally, *an exalted person,* and is applied to the head of a tribe, or other large division of the people, whether of Israel or of other nations. Lange interprets it of "the tribe chieftain," referring to Num. iii. 24. As *prince* is on the whole the most common rendering of the A. V., and expresses very well the sense, it is retained here.

[20] Ver. 23. The conjunction אוֹ should be rendered *if perhaps,* Fuerst, Gesenius. The Syr. renders by *if,* the LXX. *καί,* Vulg. *et postea.*

[21] Ver. 23. שָׂעִיר = *a he-goat,* generally understood of one older than the עַתּוּד or young he-goat used in the burnt and peace-offerings (Fuerst, Knobel). It is often rendered *kid* in the A. V. It is also rendered *devil* xvii. 7; 2 Chr. xi. 15, where the reference is to the idolatrous worship of the goat, (or goat-like deity) and twice *satyr* in Isa. (xiii. 21; xxxiv. 14). It is the kind of goat used in the sin-offering generally. Bochart supposes it to mean a goat of a peculiar breed; so Keil.

[22] Ver. 24. The Sam. puts the verb in the plural; so also in ver. 33.

[23] Ver. 25. The LXX. and 4 MSS. have *all his blood,* as in the other places.

[24] Ver. 27. There seems no occasion here to deviate from the literal translation which is retained so far as "people of the land" is concerned, in xx. 2, 4; 2 Ki. xi. 18, 19; xvi. 15. It was the common name of the whole people as distinguished from the priests (in this case probably from the high-priest) and the rulers.

[25] Ver. 28. שְׂעִירָה is simply the feminine of the word discussed under ver. 23.

[26] Ver. 30. Two MSS., the Sam., and the Syr., unnecessarily add "of burnt-offering." The Sam. and the LXX. make the same addition at the end of ver. 34.

31 bottom of the altar.[26] And he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn *it* upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the LORD; and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.

32 And if he bring a lamb [a sheep[27]] for a sin offering, he shall bring it a female
33 without blemish. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering,
34 and slay it for a sin offering in the place where they kill the burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and shall pour out all the [*other*] blood
35 thereof at the bottom of the altar: and he shall take away all the fat thereof, as the fat of the lamb [sheep[27]] is taken away from the sacrifice of the peace offerings; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, according to [upon[28]] the offerings made by fire unto the LORD: and the priest shall make an atonement for his sin that he hath committed, and it shall be forgiven him.

CHAP. V. 1. AND if a soul sin, and hear [in that he hear[29]] the voice of swearing [adjuration[30]], and *is* a witness, whether he hath seen or known *of it;* if he do not
2 utter *it*, then he shall bear his iniquity. Or if[31] a soul touch any unclean thing, whether *it be* a carcase of an unclean beast,[31a] or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things, and *if* it be hidden from him; he also shall be
3 unclean, and guilty. Or if he touch the uncleanness of man, whatsoever uncleanness *it be* that a man shall be defiled withal, and it be hid from him; when he know-
4 eth *of it*, then he shall be guilty. Or if a soul swear, pronouncing [speaking idly[32]] with *his* lips to do evil, or to do good, whatsoever *it be* that a man shall pronounce [speak idly[32]] with an oath, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth *of it*, then
5 he shall be guilty in one of these. And it shall be, when he shall be guilty[33] in one
6 of these *things*, that he shall confess that he hath sinned in that *thing:* and he shall bring his trespass offering [bring for his trespass[34]] unto the LORD, for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats [a sheep[27] or a she-goat[25]], for a sin offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his sin.

7 And if he be not able[35] to bring a lamb [sheep[27]], then he shall bring for his trespass, which he hath committed, two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, unto the
8 LORD; one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering. And he shall bring them unto the priest, who shall offer *that* which *is* for the sin offering first,
9 and wring [pinch] off his head from his neck, but shall not divide *it* asunder: and he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin offering upon the side of the altar; and the rest of the blood shall be wrung [pressed[36]] out at the bottom of the altar: it *is* a

[27] Ver. 32. כֶּבֶשׂ = a sheep, see Text. note [5] under iii. 7.

[28] Ver. 35. עַל אִשֵּׁי. The sense is here as in iii. 5 *upon*. These being special offerings, the daily burnt-offering would always have been upon the altar before them, and even if that were already wholly consumed, the expression "upon" it could still be naturally used.

[29] CHAP. V. Ver. 1. "Particula וְ ante שָׁמְעָה hic usurpatur αἰτιολογικῶς, estque vertenda *quia, eo quod*, ut Gen. xxvi. 12; Deut. xvii. 16." Rosenmueller.

[30] Ver. 1. אָלָה. Commentators are generally agreed that this should be translated *adjuration*. The verb in the Hiph. is translated *adjure* in 1 Sam. xiv. 24. See Exeg. Com. The Heb. has no word for *adjuration* as distinct from *swearing*. It is expressed in the LXX. by ὁρκισμοῦ.

[31] Ver. 2. The full form would be כִּי אֲשֶׁר; accordingly the Sam. and some MSS. prefix כִּי here and add אֲשֶׁר in ver. 4. [31a] Ver. 2. See note [1] on xi. 2.

[32] Ver. 4. לְבַטֵּא, יִבָּטֵא, *speak idly, or ill-advisedly*. Comp. βαττολογέω, Matt. vi. 7.

[33] Ver. 5. For יֶאְשַׁם the Sam. and 20 MSS. here substitute יֶחֱטָא.

[34] Ver. 6. אָשָׁם, like חַטָּאת, is used in the sense both of trespass and trespass-offering. The ancient versions leave the question between them open. The Vulg. has simply *agat penitentiam*, LXX. οἴσει περὶ ὧν ἐπλημμέλησε κυρίῳ, while the Semitic versions leave the same doubt as the Hebrew. Modern commentators are divided, but the weight of opinion accords with the Exeg. Com. At the end of the verse the Sam. and the LXX. have the fuller form, "and the priest shall make an atonement for him, for his sin which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him."

[35] Ver. 7. וְאִם־לֹא תַגִּיעַ יָדוֹ lit. *If his hand cannot acquire*. The sense is well expressed by the A. V.

[36] Ver. 9. יִמָּצֶה the translation of the A. V. *wrung* might answer here, but as the same word must be translated *pressed* in i. 15, it seems better to preserve uniformity.

10 sin offering.[37] And he shall offer the second *for* a burnt offering, according to the
manner [ordinance]: and the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin
which he hath sinned, and it shall be forgiven him.
11 But if he be not able to bring two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, then he that
sinned shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin
offering: he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put *any* frankincense thereon:
12 for it *is* a sin offering.[37] Then shall he bring it to the priest, and the priest shall
take his handful of it, *even* a memorial thereof, and burn *it* on the altar, according
13 to [upon[38]] the offerings made by fire unto the Lord: it *is* a sin offering.[37] And the
priest shall make an atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in
one of these, and it shall be forgiven him: and *the remnant* shall be the priest's,
as a meat offering [an oblation[39]].

[37] Vers. 9, 11, 12. The Sam. and many MSS. have the later feminine form of the pronoun הִיא.

[38] Ver. 12. עַל = *upon*, as iii. 5; iv. 35.

[39] Ver. 13. Oblation. Comp. ii. 1, Textual Note [2], and Exeg. at beginning of ch. ii.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The formula by which this chapter is introduced—**And the LORD spake unto Moses**—answering to i. 1, 2; v. 14; vi. 1; vi. 8, *etc.*, marks this passage as a distinct portion of the law. The offerings of chaps. i.—iii., when brought by individuals, were all voluntary, and are recognized as already familiar; but in chaps. iv., v. sacrifices are appointed (no longer voluntary) for certain offences, and these sacrifices now for the first time receive names from the purposes for which they were commanded—Sin and Trespass offerings. These specialized sacrifices were a creation of the Mosaic law, and are therefore naturally placed after the more general sacrifices of chaps. i.—iii. Lange says also: "The former class of sacrifices refer to innate sinfulness, and in so far forth to the general participation in guilt of the offerer (on which account throughout a כִּפֻּר, a covering of the offerer, takes place); but does not have reference to peculiar personal transgressions to be atoned for by the sin and trespass offerings." In the present section we have to do only with the sin offering (iv. 1—v. 13); yet this and the trespass offering are closely related, and are distinguished only as the sin or the trespass comes into the foreground, so that the line of separation is not always strongly marked, and in particular cases might even be difficult to trace. "Sin is the transgression of the law," and may involve no further harm, and requires expiation only for its own guilt; while trespass is wrong done to another (whether God or man), and involves not only sacrifice for its sin, but also amends for its harm. With neither were oblations or drink-offerings allowed; and when, in case of extreme poverty, flour was permitted as a sin-offering, it must be without oil or frankincense (v. 11).

Lange takes a somewhat different view of the relation of these two offerings, and consequently of the proper analysis of this whole passage, iv. 1—vi. 7. The substance of his views may be gathered from the headings of his several subdivisions as follows: The Sin offering and the Trespass offering (iv.—vi. 7). (*a*) The Sin-offering and the little Sin and Trespass offering (iv.—v. 13). 1. The Sin offering (iv. 1–21). 2. The little Sin offering (iv. 22–35). (*b*) The Trespass offering. 1. The little Sin and Trespass offering, or the uncleanness of the common people (v. 1–13). 2. The great Trespass offering, or guilt offering (v. 14—vi. 7). Accordingly he says: "The following considerations may serve somewhat to disentangle the question how the sections of the sin offering and the trespass offering are to be separated from one another, and whether v. 1–13 treats of the sin offering or of the trespass offering. There is, certainly, no question that all sin is at the same time guilt, a deed which has made itself into an actual state of things which must be atoned for, or has become liable to punishment. And there is also no question that guilt in general is also sin, although as participation in guilt, it may be widely separated from the centre of sinfulness, as far as the disappearing minimum, even until it is said of the guiltless Messiah in Isa. liii. that He would give his life as a trespass offering—*Asham;* and from this arises also the possibility that two classes may be formed in which the one emphasizes sin as such, while the other emphasizes more the state of guilt. The state of guilt may be very trifling, as being accessory to a guilty principal, or very evil as an original offence; in all cases it requires a proportionate penance (not expiation) or satisfaction. From the indeterminate character of the antithesis, it also comes that there may be a transitional form between the sin and the trespass offerings—a form of sin offerings which, at the same time, becomes elevated as a trespass offering. There are forms of the predominating participation in guilt, and one such we find in the section chap. v. 1–13. On the other hand, in the strict trespass offerings which follow further on, we shall take up all cases in which the offence against the holy places and rights of Jehovah, or in regard to the property of a neighbor, amount to an offence that is a violation of right, which must be atoned for by restitution, punishment and sacrifice.

"In chap. iv. 3 the sin of the High Priest brings guilt on the people—that is, the guilt of participation in guilt. Luther translates לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם *that he scandalizes the people*—a conception not very different from our own—*viz.:* that he brings upon them liability of penalty and punishment. So it is also with the congregation

of Israel: it becomes guilty through its sin (ver. 13). So also with the noble (ver. 22). So too, at last, with the common Israelite (ver. 27). Ought now the section chap. v. 1–13 to be (as Knobel) only an example to illustrate the foregoing transaction in the case of the sin offering of the common Israelite? Ver. 6 says: **And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the LORD for his sin.**" [This is probably the key to the whole view of Lange. If, however, אָשָׁם be here considered as standing not for *trespass offering*, but for *trespass* (see Text. note 34 on verse 6), the view before given seems preferable.] "It is true that both vers. 11 and 12 repeat the statement that his offering is a sin offering. But according to the context, the meaning of this is that this sacrifice must be treated entirely after the analogy of the sin offering. No incense nor oil are to be added to this sacrifice. The same rule is applied to the great trespass offerings that follow, chap. v. 14 sq. The first instance, chap. v. 1, has peculiarly the character of participation in guilt. The properly guilty person in this case is the blasphemer; the participation in guilt comes from a soul hearing the curse and not cleansing itself from defilement by giving information. The view of the Heidelberg Catechism, that "by silence and looking on one may become a participant in such fearful sins," appears here. So the touching a corpse is set with the unclean states of men by its natural connection, and the rash swearing, by traditional and common custom. That which is spoken of in the special greater crimes, as they are raised into a class by themselves by the introduction in ver. 14, is the gross violation of the law. Here, then, rightly appear the actions in which a man is guilty against Jehovah, *i. e.*, against His holy things or His law. The fraud of which the sinner has at last become conscious must be atoned for in most cases by a restitution which was increased by one-fifth of the whole amount. But legal restitution alone was not enough; it must be preceded (without mentioning the trespass offering elsewhere prescribed) by a costly sacrifice of a ram worth two shekels. As religious atonement was of little value alone, when social restitution was directed, so also restitution, as a supplementary payment, was of little worth without religious atonement.

"Now, on the one hand, we must not mistake the fact that the section chap. v. 14 sq. draws a distinction between those faults which at the same time have become debts or relate to customs (mostly legal transgressions of right, as violations of the rights of property), and the purely religious faults in which throughout (with the exception of the case in chap. v. 17–19) the sinner has only to deal with God, and so far the newer division must be considered right, as in Knobel and Keil (and so also in Kurtz and others). But, on the other hand, it must not be overlooked that the subject has already been about the offering of the *Asham* in the section v. 1 sq. [?], and this is in favor of the older opinion which may be found in the headings of Stier's translation. There is also no question that to reduce the whole guilt-idea to legal transgressions will obscure very much the guilt-idea in the present case, as when Knobel wishes to leave out of consideration the passage Isa. liii. 10, when he says "אָשָׁם can be no actual trespass offering." According to Knobel, the *Asham* arises from the rights of neighbors. But here evidently it arises from the rights of Jehovah, which Keil also emphasizes, and Knobel states indirectly. But we should rather say that it arises from the absolute right which is considered to be under Jehovah's protection, in heaven and earth, and which has been completely confused with the guilt-idea itself in the theology of the day, in which justice in its many forms is travestied by "Good disposition" (the substantive and the adjective are allowed to evaporate into the adverb). It would have been better to have found the key to the conception of guilt in Isa. liii. For just as the guilt of a sinner can extend over a community, so also the exculpation wrought by the Redeemer. The אָשָׁם expresses that man has become guilty, liable to punishment, towards Jehovah or towards his fellowman; and the emphasis lies so strongly on the liability to punishment that the same word denotes at the same time satisfaction; and conversely, the Hiphil means not merely to give satisfaction, but also to bring over others the ban of guilt as a penalty. As concerns the varying distinction between the respective sections, we must especially notice that one must proceed from the distinction between the universal guilt idea and the conception of a legal fault, falling into the theocratic judicial sphere. If this difference be held to, we can certainly establish the newer division; for in the ritual of sacrifice the distinction between the sin and trespass offerings is not to be mistaken. Knobel has stated this difference accurately, p. 394 sq. It is properly made prominent that the trespass-offering—as a religious offence makes the forgiveness of God necessary—may also be a sin-offering, so that it is frequently cited as a sin-offering. "The trespass-offering, it may then be said, was always available only for the single Israelite, and was the same for all; while the sin-offering served also for the whole people, and varied according to the standing of the sinner in the Theocracy; the trespass-offering consisted always of sheep, while in the sin-offering all sacrificial animals were allowed; the trespass-offering must be worth a definite price, and was not modified, in the case of those who were unable to offer it, to a pair of doves or a meat-offering, as was the sin-offering; in the trespass-offering, as in the burnt-offering and thank-offering, the blood was sprinkled on the side of the altar of burnt-offering (vii. 2); in the sin-offering, on the other hand, departing from the custom in all other sacrifices, it was brought before God (iv. 5); the flesh in the trespass-offering always belonged to the priest (vii. 6), while in the more especial sin-offerings it was burned." Then the distinction of the occasions may be expressed as follows: 1) Dishonesty against the revenues of the priests, as against the holy things of Jehovah. 2) Dishonesty in the due fidelity towards a neighbor (in a trust, in a deposit, in property found). 3) Dishonest

use of authority over a maid betrothed to another man (xix. 20). 4) DEFRAUDING in regard to the preference of the daughters of Israel over heathen women (Ezra x. 19). Besides these, the VIOLATION of the Ark of the Covenant by the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 3); IMPERILLING the congregation by the contagious leprosy (xiv. 12); DEFILEMENT of the Nazarite, as weakening the inviolability of his vow (Num. vi. 12). "According to these examples the trespass-offering is distinguished from the sin-offering in the following manner: it arises from the right of a neighbor, and rests upon a violation of this right." But Jehovah too claims satisfaction, "since He has fixed the rights of those pertaining to Him." Or also the right simply claims satisfaction: a particular instance is the case of a guilty person who has gone astray, through oversight or heedlessness, in a way that is known to no one but himself; who afterwards has an uneasy conscience, and then feels himself burdened by his misdeed, and becomes conscious of his guilt (v. 17, 18). Otherwise indeed, he would be unable to atone, for instance, for his false oath. With the former division one could with propriety reverse the designations, and term the sin-offering the trespass-offering, and the trespass-offering for the most part the sin-offering, the offering for real and ideal transgressions of right. In this confusion of ideas the manifold differences are not too prominent as they are cited in Knobel, p. 396, Keil, p. (53) 316, Winer (Schuld und Sündopfer) and others. If we go back briefly to the ideal distinctions: sin, as sin, is indeed guilt, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, the particular evil deed; guilt, as such, on the contrary, is the entire effect of sin in its cosmic sphere from the bad conscience even to death, to Sheol, to Hell. Guilt, as such, falls within the circle of evil, although the axiom "guilt is the greatest of evils" refers to sin. The sinfulness in guilt is the temptation to further sinfulness; it has, however, also a natural influence, according to which it reacts upon sin. See the article "*Schuld*" in Herzog's *Real-encyclopädie*. Guilt rests in the *legal* effect, there must be satisfaction for it; in the *ethical* effect, evil conscience, false position towards God, temptation to new sin; in the *social* effect, it lies as a burden upon the sphere of life that surrounds the sinner, whether he be high or low; in the *generic* effect, it is visited upon the children of the fathers, and becomes a universal might, a cosmic evil. Sin is solitary, guilt is common ("forgive us our trespasses"). It is obvious that sin in all cases is originally guilt; but guilt in distinction from sin is, in many cases, only participation in sin—*accessoriness*. Even in the section of the great trespass-offering, the force of participation in guilt may not be entirely wanting, for the severity of the Levitical relations, the temptations which adhered to the church goods and lands, to property, come into consideration. Under the law the *ignorant* man is touched on all sides, and is thus constituted in some measure a sinner, an accessory through greater sinners who made the law necessary. Sin is like a stone cast into a lake; guilt like the wave-circles which go out from it, the circumference of that evil centre. Sin, in its consequences, is ideally an *infinitum*, enmity against God; guilt, in itself considered, is a self-consuming *finitum*, so far as it is not changed into a curse by its constant reciprocity with sin. Sin can only be done away through the reconciliation of person to person; it requires repentance. Guilt is to be done away by means of atonement (voluntary penance, not expiation), personal or vicarious restitution; for, on the one hand, this of course is preliminary to the completed reconciliation, and, on the other hand, that breaks the way for expiation. See the history of Jacob: the vision of the heavenly ladder preceded the wrestling at the Jabbok. Keil says somewhat differently: "As in the sin-offering the idea of expiation or atonement for sin, indicated in the sprinkling of blood, comes forward, so in the trespass-offering we find the idea of satisfaction for the purpose of restoring the violated rightful order."

In what follows, the views previously presented will be followed, since the rendering of אָשָׁם by *trespass* rather than by *trespass-offering* in v. 6 renders it unnecessary to enter upon much of the nice distinctions here drawn by Lange, and enables us clearly to separate the sections of the sin and the trespass-offering.

Lange continues: "Ch. iv. 1. Sin, חַטָּאת, as *missing*, is in Leviticus more particularly missing in regard to the holy fellowship with the holy God through transgression of His command or violation of the reverence due Him. It must, as debt, be paid for by punishment. It makes the sinner unclean, so that he cannot appear in God's fellowship, and hence uncleanness is a symbolic representation of sin, and the unclean needs, when cleansed, a sin-offering for a token and sign of his cleanness. It is understood that the sin offering that was introduced into the law by Moses preceded the given law; and so it is easily to be supposed that voluntary sin-offerings from compulsion of conscience most probably must be as old as the sacrifice in general, as certainly in the Passover the force of the sin offering may be plainly recognized."—[Lange must mean that the more general sacrifices of old often included within them the idea of the sin offering, as they did of every other sacrifice; but the specialized *sin offering* itself, as already pointed out, is not mentioned before Ex. xxix. 14, nor is there any evidence that it was used or known at an earlier date.]—"On the extra-theocratic sin offering see Knobel, p. 386. But it is not correct to see with Knobel in the death of the sacrificial animal an actual *satisfactio vicaria* of the sinner, or to find in the death of the animal the expression that the offerer had already deserved death. In regard to the first point, the sacrificial animal furnishes *only in the symbolical sense* what the offerer ought to furnish personally, but cannot. And as to the second point, the death-punishment, in the peace-offering, it is self-evident, that the reference could not be to the punishment of death, and also in the sin-offering the difference between the *Cherem*" [חֵרֶם=a curse, a thing devoted to destruction] "and the propitiation through the sacrifice must be considered. That the divine Justice should have punished

an inadvertence, בִּשְׁגָגָה, with death is an overstraining of the confession (with which the sacrificer appeared before God), that by this oversight or going astray he had entered the paths of death,* as this idea indeed belongs to pardonable sin. Otherwise an arbitrary distinction would have to be drawn between sin with uplifted hand, and sin from inadvertence, under which head must be understood not only sins of ignorance and precipitation, but also natural weakness and heedlessness. The turning point of these sins lay in contrition. But the sacrificer could in reality hardly satisfy the theocratic order by his sacrifice; on the religious side his sacrifice was thus a confession of his inability to satisfy, an appeal for mercy; and hence the sacrifice became a typical prophetic movement towards the future satisfaction."

The sins for which sin offerings were to be presented were offences against the Divine law much more in its moral than in its ceremonial aspect. Great offences against civil society, such as involuntary manslaughter (Num. xxxv. 10-15; Deut. xix. 1-10), did not come within the scope of these sacrifices; and minor breaches of the ceremonial law, such as uncleanness from contact with the dead bodies of animals (Lev. xi. 24, 28) or men (Num. xix. 11, 19, 20), were otherwise provided for. The sin offering had relation much more to the individual conscience than to the theocratic state or the peculiar Hebrew polity. In Num. xv. 29 its privileges are expressly extended to the "stranger." But it was not allowed to be offered in cases where no true penitence could be supposed to exist, and it was therefore not permitted in the case of presumptuous or defiant sins (Num. xv. 30, 31).

The idea of vicarious satisfaction necessarily appears more clearly in this specialized offering for sin than in other sacrifices which were either more general in their character, or specialized for other purposes. (The word חַטָּאת occurs several times in Genesis in the sense of *sin*, but never in the sense of *sin offering*, before Ex. xxix. 14). Hence, in view of the intrinsic insufficiency of animal victims to atone for moral offences, this sacrifice was emphatically typical of the true Sacrifice for sin to come. The object of all the divine dealings with man has been his restoration to communion with God by the restoration of his holiness; and the first step to this end was necessarily the putting away of his sin. Under the old dispensation, therefore, the typical sin offering was the culmination of its whole system, presented in the most emphatic form on the great day of atonement (chap. xvi.); just as under the new dispensation the culmination of Christ's work for the redemption of His people was His atoning sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross of Calvary.

Unlike the preceding sacrifices, the victim in the sin offering varied according to the offender's rank in the theocracy. The ground of this is to be sought in the conspicuousness of the offence, not at all in its grossness. Here, as elsewhere, there was no correlation between the value of the victim and the magnitude of the sin. Every sin, great or small, of the same class of persons was expiated by the same means; a victim of higher value was only required in consequence of official responsibility and position, and the consequently greater strain which offences brought upon the theocracy. There was no such gradation in the Trespass offering, which was related more to the harm done than to the sin committed. Four grades are prescribed: for the sin—(1) of the high-priest (3–12); (2) of the whole congregation (13–21); (3) of a prince (22–26); (4) of any of the people of the land (27–35). After this follows an enumeration of special sins for which confession should be made and sin offerings offered (v. 1–6), with the allowance of inferior offerings in case of poverty (7–13).

Vers. 1, 2. The general condition of the sin offering.

Ver. 2. **Speak unto the children of Israel.**—It is always to be remembered that these laws are given to a people already in covenant relation to God, and the essential point of that covenant was the promise of the final victory over sin in the person of "the seed of the woman." The laws given until He should come are therefore necessarily based upon His coming, and look forward to Him.

Any of the commandments.—מִכֹּל in a partitive sense. At the close of this verse must be understood some such clause as *he shall bring an offering for his sin.* The actual apodosis of the verse is the whole following chapter, and not ver. 3, which relates only to the high-priest.

Vers. 3–12. The sin offering of the high-priest. Lange here says: "It must be noticed that the high-priest could become the most guilty of all, which the haughtiness of the hierarchy never thought of enough; that the whole congregation was rated as *one* personality equal in rank to him; that the prince was only considered slightly greater than the common man (the difference is he goats, she goats, or an ewe); and that for the poor, in the section v. 1-13, there were two more peculiar modifications."

Ver. 3. **The priest that is anointed.**—LXX.: *ἀρχιερεύς*, הַכֹּהֵן הַמָּשִׁיחַ = *high-priest*, Targums. The high-priest is so called by reason of the peculiar authority by which he alone was consecrated to his office (Ex. xxix. 7; chap. viii. 12). The anointing of all the priests was indeed expressly commanded (Ex. xxviii. 41; xl. 15), and is recognized as having taken place vii. 36; x. 7; Num. iii. 3; yet in the account of the consecration, chap. viii., no other anointing of the common priests is mentioned than that Moses sprinkled both them and Aaron with "the anointing oil" and the blood from the altar. According to the best Jewish authorities, however, the priests were anointed with the finger upon the forehead. Outram places the distinction in the fact that each successive high-priest was personally anointed, while the others were only anointed once for all in the persons of Aaron's immediate sons. Whatever may be the truth in regard to these things, the high-priest is evidently regarded in a peculiar sense as anointed, and is

* "It is also a straining of the text to render the words: "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," as meaning "thou shalt actually die the death." Religio-moral death realizes itself gradually. Indeed, the principle of death is the germ of death itself."

generally designated in Lev. (iv. 5, 16; vi. 22; xvi. 32) as the anointed priest. He is also called the הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל=*great priest* (xxi. 10; Num. xxxv. 25, 28 *bis*; Josh. xx. 6), and in later times the *head* or *chief* priest (2 Kings xxv. 18; 2 Chr. xix. 11), or simply *the* priest, κατ' ἐξοχήν (1 Kings ii. 35, *etc.*).

Do sin.—Origen (Hom. II. in Lev. § 1) observes that inadvertence is not specified in the case of the high-priest. It must, of course, be supposed in view of the general principles on which sacrifices were allowed at all; but it probably was not written in the law that the infirmity of the high-priest might not be made too prominent.

To the guilt of the people, לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם—*i. e.*, to bring upon the people the guilt of his own transgression. It is an undue restriction of the sense of these words to limit them to the sins committed by the high-priest in his official capacity. Such sins, of course, did bring guilt upon the people (Lev. x. 17; Mal. ii. 7, 8); but over and above this, nothing can be clearer in history, both under the old covenant and in the world at large, than that God had so constituted men with a federal as well as individual relation, that the sins of the head, whether of the nation, the community, or the family, entail suffering upon its members. The high-priest as the head of the theocracy could not sin, but that the whole body of Israel should feel its effects. The distinction may indeed be made between natural and moral consequences, between earthly and future punishments; still the two things are so intimately connected, a debasing of the moral sense of the community is so much the effect of the unfaithfulness of its head that the spiritual condition of the Israelites, following the general law, was largely affected by that of their high-priest, so that his sins did indeed "bring guilt upon the people."

A young bullock without blemish.—The high-priest's sin offering was the same as that of the whole congregation (ver. 14), not merely because of the conspicuousness of his position and of the gravity of sin in one who should be the leader to all holiness; but especially (see ver. 3) because of his representative character and his federal headship mentioned above. According to Jewish tradition, if the bullock of the high-priest and the bullock of the congregation stood together ready for sin offerings, the former had the preference in every way. There was a careful gradation of the victims for the sin offering: the high priest and the whole congregation offered a male—a young bullock; the prince offered also a male, but of the goats (ver. 23); the people offered a female of either the goats (ver. 28) or the sheep (ver. 32). There was also a corresponding gradation, but with fewer steps, in the ritual in regard to the blood, and also in the disposition of the flesh. See below.

Ver. 4. The presentation, laying on of hands, and slaughtering, were the same (vers. 4, 14, 15, 23, 24), as in the case of other sacrifices (i. 3–5).

Vers. 5–7. **And the priest that is anointed shall take.**—At the point of the treatment of the blood the difference between the ritual of the sin offerings and the other sacrifices begins, and this treatment differs somewhat in the several sin offerings themselves. In this case, the high-priest, who was himself the offerer, brought some of the blood to the tabernacle of the congregation; afterwards the person officiating is designated simply *the priest*. From this it has been argued that, as the high-priest was the one whose sin was to be atoned for, the service was here taken up on his behalf by another priest; but there is precisely the same change at the same point in the following offering for the whole congregation (vers. 16, 17), and the high-priest certainly officiated throughout on the great day of atonement (chap. xvi.); moreover, the fact of his offering the sin offering for himself as well as for the people is established by Heb. v. 3.

Ver. 6. **Sprinkle of the blood.**—The word הִזָּה is different from זָרַק used for sprinkle in chaps. i. and iii. in view of the much smaller quantity of blood used here. It is difficult to express this in English translation, though the difference is observed in the LXX. and Vulg.

Seven times.—The seven-fold sprinkling of blood is frequently commanded (ver. 17: xvi. 17, 19; Num. xix. 4) always in connection with sin offering, or (xiv. 7, 27) with the purification of leprosy. In consecrations, too, there was a seven-fold sprinkling of oil (viii. 11; xiv. 16), and frequently the number seven is designated for the victims in sacrifice (xxiii. 18; Num. xxiii. 1, 4, 14, 29; xxviii. 11, 19, 27; xxix. 2, 8, 13, 36). The same number also appears in many other particulars connected with the divine service, and has always been considered as symbolical of completeness and perfection. The number is so frequent in the divine word, as well as in the ordering of nature, that it must be thought to have its foundation in some unfathomable heavenly relations. Its use in connection with the sin offering is plainly to give emphasis to the typical completeness of the propitiation.

Before the veil of the sanctuary.—There is a variety of opinion as to precisely where the blood was sprinkled. The LXX.: κατὰ τὸ καταπέτασμα, and the Vulg.: *contra velum*, seem to have supposed it was upon the veil itself. It is more probable that the high-priest, dipping his finger in the blood at the entrance of the sanctuary, sprinkled it before him towards the veil as he advanced to the altar of incense. The object was plainly the presenting of the blood before Jehovah, the manifestation of whose presence was on the ark just within the veil. "The objective point was not the veil, but the ark of the covenant." Lange.

Ver. 7. **Upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense**—the golden altar which stood immediately before the veil. It was only in the case of the sin-offerings for the high-priest and for the whole people (ver. 18) that the blood was brought to this altar—doubtless on account of the especial gravity of the sins to be atoned for; in case of the other sin offerings the blood was put on the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, (vers. 25, 30, 34) which stood in the court without. It was to be put in either case upon *the horns* of the altar because in these the significance of the altar culminated, and in the sin

offering, as has already appeared, and will still more fully appear, the utmost emphasis was to be given to every part of the ritual of propitiation.

Shall pour all the blood.—But very little of the blood had thus far been used; the remainder—*all the blood*—was to be poured out at the foot of the altar of burnt-offering, the place to which all blood of the sacrifices not otherwise required was to be brought; it had no sacrificial significance. During the life in the wilderness the blood of the comparatively small number of sacrifices was here absorbed by the earth; later, in the temple conduits were arranged by which it was carried off into the valley of the Kedron.

Vers. 8–10. The fat of the sin-offering was to be treated in the same way as that of the peace offering, only that it is not said that it shall be burned "upon the burnt offering" since when both were offered the sin offering came first (xvi. 11, 15, 24); neither is the burning of the fat described as "an offering made by fire, of a sweet savor unto the LORD."

Vers. 11, 12. The disposition of the rest of the victim, *i. e.*, of the whole animal except the blood and the fat, was the same in the sin offering of the high-priest and of the whole congregation (vers. 20, 21). The difference in the treatment of the flesh of these from that of other sin offerings is determined by the treatment of the blood (vi. 30). When the blood had been brought within the sanctuary, the flesh must be wholly burned; yet not burned as a sacrifice, the word שָׂרַף being never used in that sense.

Without the camp.—No flesh of a sin-offering might be burned upon the altar, because the nature of the offering was purely propitiatory, and it did not admit of being so used as to be called "the food of the offering made by fire unto the Lord" (see on iii. 11). It is described as "most holy" (vi. 25), and unlike the flesh of any other sacrifice, affected everything with which it came in contact (vi. 26-28); whatever it touched must either be destroyed or specially purified. This was the law for all sin-offerings, and a further law comes into play in regard to those sacrifices (that of the high-priest and that of the whole congregation) whose blood was brought within the sanctuary (vi. 30). Their flesh was strictly forbidden to be eaten; and it remained that it must be destroyed in some other way. Hence the command that it should be "burned without the camp." Yet this was not a mere convenience, resorted to because there was nothing else to be done with it. The burning without the camp had a deep symbolical teaching of sufficient prominence to be referred to in Heb. xiii. 11, 12, and applied to Christ. The ground of the law seems to be that the flesh of all sin offerings was in a peculiar sense "holy"—devoted, under the ban—because they were for the propitiation for sin; yet a gradation was to be observed between them in this as in other respects. Their blood had been offered before the Lord, but when the blood had been offered in a more peculiar and emphatic way by bringing it within the sanctuary itself; a corresponding emphasis must mark the treatment of the flesh by carrying it forth to burn without the camp. The red heifer, whose ashes were to be used for purification, (Num. xix.) was to be burned in the same way. The sinfulness of sin and the importance and sacredness of everything connected with its propitiation were thus set before the people in the strongest light.

Unto a clean place—not carelessly anywhere, lest it might happen to be to an "unclean place" (xiv. 40); but **where the ashes are poured out**, which was not merely "clean," but being used only in connection with sacred things, had itself acquired a certain sacred association. The word שָׂרַף, as already noted, indicates that the burning itself was not sacrificial. The same word is used for the burning of the red heifer, Num. xix. 5. No especial sin offering is provided for the ordinary priest. It was the spirit of the law to have as little as possible of the caste relation about the priests, and in all matters in which they were not necessarily separated by their official functions, to treat them as ordinary citizens. Their sin-offering was doubtless the same with that of "any one of the people of the land."

Vers. 13–21. The sin-offering of the whole congregation.

If the whole congregation of Israel sin.—Prominent among the ways in which a whole congregation might sin are these: The civil ruler might do that which involved the nation in sin, and brought down punishment upon it, as in Saul's slaughter of the Gibeonites, or David's numbering of the people; a single individual by an act which caused a breach of the divine commands given to the whole people, might bring sin upon them all, as in the case of Achan, Josh. vii. 1; or the people generally might commit some special sin, as in 1 Sam. xiv. 32, or fall into some habitual neglect of the divine commands, as in regard to the Sabbatical year (2 Chr. xxxvi. 21), and the neglect of tithes and offerings for which they are so frequently reproved by the later prophets.

Through inadvertence.—There were two kinds of such sin: first, inadvertence of conduct, where the sinfulness of the act would be acknowledged when attention was called to it; and secondly, inadvertence of the law, when the act would not be known to be sinful until the law had been explained. In either case there would be no consciousness or intention of sin, and the thing **would be hid from the eyes of the assembly.**

And are guilty.—Every transgression of the divine law brought guilt, whether through a faulty heedlessness of conduct, or a criminal ignorance of the law which had been given. This principle is abundantly recognized in the New Testament.

Vers. 14–21. The ritual of the sin offering for the whole congregation is the same as that for the high-priest. The victim prescribed here is a bullock; in Num. xv. 24 a kid in addition is required for sins of inadvertence of the congregation. Either the law was modified, which seems unlikely, or else the two requirements have reference to some distinction in the occasion or character of the sin, such as in one case

sins of omission, in the other of commission. There was also another and very peculiar sin-offering for the congregation prescribed on the especial occasion of the great day of atonement (xvi. 5). The high-priest's sin offering is there unchanged; but that for the people is highly altered in view of the especial purpose of the day.

Ver. 15. **The elders**—since the congregation could only perform the acts required of the offerer by means of their representatives.

Ver. 20. **And the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them.**—This naturally was not said in regard to the high-priest's own sin offering, but is repeated in connection with those that follow (vers. 26, 31, 35; v. 6, 10, 13), and elsewhere in the same connection (Num. xv. 25, 28); also in connection with the trespass offering (v. 16, 18; vi. 7; xix. 22). It is also used in connection with the purificatory offerings, the change being made from *forgiveness* to *cleansing* as the result of the atonement (xii. 7, 8; xiv. 20, 53; Num. viii. 21). The use of the simpler form "make atonement for him" in connection with the burnt-offering has already been noticed. The priest in these cases unquestionably acted, and was understood by the people to act, in a mediatorial capacity. כִּפֶּר, as noticed under i. 4, means literally, *to cover, to put out of sight, to hide.* What is promised here is of course not that God will cause to be undone the wrong that has been done; but that He will so put it out of His sight that the sinner may stand without fault in His presence. See the various expressions to this effect in the prophets, *e. g.*, Ps. lxxxv. 2; ciii. 12; xxxviii. 17; xliii. 25; xliv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 34; Ezek. xviii. 22; xxxiii. 16; Mic. vii. 18, 19, *etc.* This atonement was thus effectual in removing the guilt of all transgression (other than wilful) against the divine law. Hence the efficacy of the sin-offering could only have been derived from its typical relation to Him who was the Propitiation for the sins of the whole world. (1 Jno. ii. 2).

Vers. 22-26. The sin offering for a Prince.

The ritual in this case differs from that in the previous cases, first in the selection of the victim, which must now be a he-goat instead of a bullock; and secondly, in that the blood was not presented within the sanctuary, which involved consequently a difference in the disposition of the flesh.

Ver. 24. **In the place where they kill the burnt offering**—*i. e.*, the burnt-offering "of the flock," on the north side of the altar, i. 11.

Ver. 25. **The horns of the altar of burnt offering.**—In this and the following cases, as the sin was less extensive in its effects, so the ritual was far more simple. There was no sprinkling of blood before the veil, and the great altar in the court was substituted for the altar of incense within the sanctuary. The fat was burned as before; on the disposition of the flesh, see vi. 26-29.

Vers. 27-35. The sin offering for one of the people.

In this case the victim is changed to a female, but the ritual remains the same in all respects as in the sin offering of the prince. An option was allowed as to the victim whether it should be of the goats, which seems to have been preferred (vers. 28-31), or of the sheep (vs. 32-35).

Chap. v. 1-13. Certain specified sins and the sin-offering for them.

There is a difference of opinion among commentators as to whether this section should be connected with the sin-offerings which precede, or with the trespass offerings which follow. See Lange's discussion under iv. 1. The chief argument for the latter is from the use of the word אָשְׁמוֹ, ver. 6 (see below), which, however, rightly understood, does not bear out the inference. On the other hand, these verses are distinctly a part of the same divine communication begun iv. 1, while another begins at v. 14; the word sin-offering is expressly used throughout (vers. 6, 7, 9, 11); and the idea of compensation for the harm done, prominent in the trespass offering (especially ver. 16), only slightly appears (ver. 6) in these offerings. They are reckoned with the sin offerings by Knobel and Keil. They may perhaps be considered as somewhat intermediate between the ordinary sin offering and the trespass offering, yet belonging in the category of the former. The sins for which they were to be offered were of a less flagrant character than those of ch. iv.

Four particular cases of inadvertent sins are first mentioned, vers. 1–4 (for vers. 2 and 3 are clearly to be distinguished); and then confession (ver. 5) and an offering (vers. 6-13) is required for each. The normal offering is prescribed in ver. 6, a substitute allowed in case of poverty, vers. 7-10, and a further substitute in case of extreme poverty, vers. 11-13. Only in regard to these substitutes is the ritual given, that for the normal sin offering having been already described in ch. iv.

Ver. 1. The case here specified is that of a witness put upon oath who withholds testimony as to that which is within his own certain knowledge—וְהוּא עֵד. It is the omission, according to our phraseology, "to tell the whole truth." It may cover also the case of neglect to testify when a public demand for information has been made with an adjuration; St. Augustine (Quest. in Lev. I.) and Theodoret extend it also to the case of hearing testimony, known to be false, given under oath. The case of giving positive false witness is quite a different one, and is treated in Deut. xix. 16-19.

Adjuration.—In the forms of Jewish trial, the witness did not himself utter the oath, or express his assent to it, but was *adjured* by the magistrate. Comp. Matt. xxvi. 63; 2 Chron. xviii. 15.

Whether he hath seen or known.—This covers both the cases of eye-witness and of knowledge derived from any other source.

Bear his iniquity.—Until purged in the way herein provided. The expression is a very common one in the law (vii. 18; xvii. 16; xix. 8; xx. 17; xxiv. 15; Num. v. 31; ix. 13; xiv. 33, 34, *etc.*), and means that he shall endure the punishment of the sin, whether in its natural consequences or in positive inflictions. It is used both with reference to capital sins and also

to those which might be expiated by sacrifice. If the sacrifice were not offered, the sinner must bear the consequences of his sin. In this case confession (ver. 5) was a necessary condition of the sin-offering; therefore **if he do not utter it**, for without this there could be no desire to be again at one with God, and hence no place for the offering of sacrifice.

Ver. 2. The second case is that of uncleanness from touching the carcase of any unclean animal, and was a sin of a ceremonial character.

It be hidden from him.—For the uncleanness of this and the following verse simple and speedy forms of purification were provided in case immediate action were taken (xi. 24, 25, 28, 39, 40; xv. 5, 8, 21; Num. xix. 22); but if it were neglected or unobserved, the defilement still actually existed, and as the offender was in danger of communicating his own uncleanness to others, and also of constant violation of the precepts of the law, it must be expiated by sacrifice. On the connection between uncleanness and sin, see preliminary note to ch. xi.

Ver. 3. **Or if he touch the uncleanness of man.**—A special case is made of this in order, as everywhere in the law, to emphasize the distinction between man and the lower animals. Thus while observed impurity from contact with the carcase of an unclean animal was removed at even after washing the clothes (xi. 24, *etc.*), and neglected might be expiated by the sin-offering, the impurity from contact with the human dead body continued seven days, and required repeated purifications (Num. xix. 11-16); and neglected, the offender defiled the tabernacle, and must "be cut off from Israel." The various kinds of uncleanness in man are detailed in chs. xi.–xv.

When he knoweth of it.—This expression is to be taken in connection with the "it be hidden from him" of ver. 2. Of course while the defilement was "hidden" there could be no consciousness of guilt, nor of moral sin; yet the transgression of the law was an existing fact, and entailed its consequences. When it was brought to the offender's knowledge, then he was guilty in the further sense that he was bound to remove the already existing guilt by confession and sacrifice.

Ver. 4. The fourth and last case specified is that of careless or forgotten oaths, not embracing the breach of the third commandment; but the neglect or forgetfulness to perform an oath (such as might be uttered in recklessness or passion).—**To do evil, or to do good.**—That is to do anything whatever. Comp. Num. xxiv. 13; Isa. xli. 23.

Ver. 5. **And it shall be, when.**—A form to introduce the apodosis to each of the previous verses.

He shall confess.—This applies to the particular sins mentioned in the foregoing verses, not to the sin-offering in general. It is also required in the case of the trespass offering, Num. v. 6, 7. According to Jewish tradition a prayer and confession accompanied the laying on of the hand in all offerings. This is a distinct acknowledgment of the particular fault, apparently before presenting the victim.

Ver. 6. **Bring for his trespass.**—The Hebrew being exactly the same as in the following verse, it seems better to give the same translation. The A. V. has also the same translation in vers. 15 and 25 (vi. 6). The phrase is thus parallel to, and in apposition with, **for his sin which he hath sinned.** The sacrifice for this is expressly called a sin offering in this verse and vers. 7, 11, 12. By this rendering the sin and the trespass offerings are kept distinct as they were certainly intended to be.

A female from the flock.—The victim and the ritual are precisely the same as in the sin offering for "one of the people of the land," and probably vers. 1-4 are intended to apply only to sins committed by them.

Vers. 7-10. The alternative offering of the poor.

As in the case of the voluntary burnt offering (i. 14-17), so in this of the required sin offering, the poor are allowed to bring pigeons or turtle-doves.

One for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering.—The two together evidently constitute the full sin-offering; but they are called by these names because the treatment of the two birds was different, and each after the analogy of the offering from which it is named. The bird being too small to admit of its parts being disposed of as a sin offering, two were required, one of which was undoubtedly (although this is not expressed) to be eaten by the priest, as is stated in the Mishna, after the fashion of the flesh of the sin offering (vi. 26, 29; vii. 7); the other was to be burned on the altar like the fat of that sacrifice.

Ver. 8. **Pinch off the head.**—See under i. 15. In this case the head was not to be entirely separated, but pinched off enough to allow the blood to flow and to kill the bird.

Ver. 9. **Sprinkle of the blood.**—This was not done in the case of the bird for the burnt-offering. It could easily be accomplished by swinging the bleeding bird against the side of the altar.

Pressed out at the bottom.—Where the blood of the other sin offerings was poured. In the burnt offering this blood (i. 15) was pressed out against the side of the altar.

Ver. 10. The ritual of the second bird was to be the same as when birds were offered for a burnt offering (i. 15-17). The two birds together constituted a complete sin offering. From the fact, however, that two were required, it is plain that the part of the offering not required to be consumed upon the altar was still essential to the sacrifice.

Vers. 11-13. The second alternative for the extremely poor.

This was allowed, on account of the absolute necessity of the sin offering, in order to put it within the reach of all. Lange notes that the sins specified in this section are, for the most part, sins arising from the lowness and rudeness of the inferior people: the law seeks to refine them. Still it is to be remembered that this alternative offering was not only for the sins mentioned v. 1-13, but for all sins reached by the sin offering. The fact that it was unbloody is not opposed to the general significance of the shedding of blood in connection with the remis-

sion of sin (Heb. ix. 22), since this alternative was altogether of an exceptional character and allowed only in case of necessity. It was also supplemented by the general sin offering on the great day of atonement.

The tenth part of an Ephah.—The Ephah according to Josephus was about 1 1-9 bushels; according to the Rabbins, rather less than half that amount. The tenth of an Ephah (called an Omer, Ex. xvi. 36) was therefore, according to the lower and more probable estimate, very nearly three pints and a half.

He shall put no oil upon it.—The sin-offering of flour was sharply distinguished from the oblation of the same (ii. 5) by the absence of the oil and frankincense, just as the other sin offerings were marked by the absence of the oblations. In both cases, the difference indicates that the offerer stood in a different relation toward God, not that of one in communion with Him, but of one seeking atonement for the sin which separated from Him.

Ver. 12. On the "handful" and "memorial" see on ii. 2.

Ver. 13. **In one of these.**—As in ver. 5, one of the sins specified, vers. 1-4.

As an oblation, *i. e.* as most holy. Comp. under ii. 3. The character of the sin offering in its two parts is still preserved in this its humblest form.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. One of the plainest teachings of the sin offering is that everything opposed to the revealed will of God is sin, whether done with the purpose of transgressing it or not. Butler has shown that this is in perfect accordance with the divine law in nature. St. Paul considered himself the chief of sinners, because he "persecuted the Church of God;" yet as he obtained mercy because he did it ignorantly in unbelief (1 Tim. i. 13–15), so the sin-offering was provided for those who put themselves in opposition to the divine will without intending to do so. It was on this principle that Jesus could pray for those who nailed Him to the cross: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do" (Luke xxiii. 34). The great mass of human sin is incurred not for the sake of sinning, but in heedlessness, or through wrong judgment, or under the impulse of passion. It comes under the head of sins of inadvertence; but, as of old, needs the intervention of the blood of the atonement before the sinner can be restored to communion with God.

II. In the law of the sin offering it appears clearly that under the old dispensation as well as the new the character of the sin was determined by the *animus* of the sinner. For high-handed and defiant sin no sacrifice was allowable; he who committed this put himself out of the pale of reconciliation. But he who committed sins—which might in themselves be far worse—"through inadvertence" might bring his offering and have "an atonement made for him." An excellent historical illustration may be found in comparing the stories of the lives of Saul and of David; and the distinction between the two kinds of sin is expressed in the psalm of David (xix. 12).

III. In the sin offering the offerer must have already been in a state of mind which led him to desire the forgiveness of his sin, as is shown by his very act of bringing his victim to the priest; he was also ready to confess his sin; yet still the offering was required. By this was taught in outward symbol to the people of the old dispensation what is so clearly proclaimed in the Gospel, that for the forgiveness of sin there must be some propitiation outside and beyond the sinner himself; mere penitence, though an essential prerequisite, cannot alone avail to restore the disturbed relations to God of one who has transgressed His law.

IV. The inherent inefficacy of these sacrifices to atone for sin has been already repeatedly noticed; moreover, this inefficacy was constantly brought to the mind of the worshipper by the repetition of the sin offerings, as is especially noted in regard to the sacrifices of the day of atonement in the Ep. to the Heb. (ix. 6-8); still the sin offering is insisted upon in the law with an emphasis greater than belongs to any other sacrifice. Most clearly, therefore, does it point to the "Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world."

V. In the extension of the privileges of the sin-offering in Num. xv. 29 to "the stranger" one of those many intimations is given, scattered everywhere throughout the Old Test., which the Israelites were so slow to understand, that the blessings of forgiveness and of approach to God were intended for all people, and that the narrowness of restriction to the children of Abraham after the flesh was only a temporary provision "because of transgressions" until the promised Seed should come. But even while the restriction continued the stranger in Israel might present his sin offering, and Israel's priests must make atonement for him.

VI. The sacramental value of the sin offering is happily expressed by Calvin in Lev. iv. 22. "In truth they hold not the first rudiments of the faith who do not recognize that the legal ceremonies were sacraments. But in all sacraments, at least those which are regular in the church, there is a spiritual promise annexed. It follows therefore that forgiveness was truly promised to the Fathers who reconciled themselves to God by the victims offered; not that the slaughter of sheep could expiate sins, but because this was a symbol, certain and impossible to deceive, in which pious souls might rest so that they could dare to appear before God in calm confidence. In fine, as sins are now sacramentally washed away by baptism, so under the law also sacrifices were expiations, although in a different fashion; since baptism sets before us Christ immediately, who was only obscurely shadowed forth under the law. Improperly indeed is that transferred to the signs which belongs to Christ alone, in whom is set forth to us the truth of all spiritual good, and who finally did away sin by His single and perpetual sacrifice. But since the question is not what the sacrifices availed in themselves, let it suffice that they testified of the grace of God of which they were figures."

VII. The ritual of the sin offering was the most solemn of all the sacrifices, and the blood

of this (except in case of the alternative doves) was always to be placed at least on the horns of the altar, while that of the greatest burnt or peace-offering was only sprinkled on its sides; thus the forgiveness of sin is shown to be the most fundamental and necessary part of the whole approach to God.

VIII. No sin offerings, although some of them were "burned without the camp," were ever wholly burned upon the altar, and the common expression in regard to other sacrifices, "the food of the Lord" is never applied to these. Frankincense and oil were not allowed with the vegetable, nor an oblation with the animal sin offering. The whole ritual was stern and severe, until by the sacrifice itself propitiation had been made. By this symbolism is set forth the attitude of the Infinite in holiness towards sin; and thus is seen what must have been the consequences to the sinner, except for the Propitiation that is in Christ Jesus.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The "exceeding sinfulness of sin" is shown in every possible symbolical way by this offering. It has in it nothing of the oil of gladness, or the fragrance of frankincense; it has nothing of festive joy, or of communion between the worshipper and God. Yet dark as the shadow of sin is hereby shown to be, it appears on all occasions when man comes into the presence of God. The sin offering was presented for "the people, on all the great festivals and days of solemn convocation, on Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles, on the Day of Memorial, on the first day of the seventh month, and on the Day of Atonement" (Kalisch) and on many other public occasions. Besides all these, it was offered continually by individuals as the sins of their own lives were brought to their consciousness. So must man's approach to God ever be with the plea, "Have mercy upon me, a sinner." Coming in this temper, propitiation is provided for all. There was none so poor but that a sin offering was within his reach. And so the word of the great Propitiation is, "Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out." "He is able to save unto the uttermost them that come unto God by Him."

Yet for high-handed and defiant sin, for sin that sets itself in opposition to the Divine way of salvation, there is no other way of forgiveness, "there remains no more sacrifice." Comp. Heb. x. 26.

For the sin of the high-priest a higher victim was commanded, and with a higher ritual, because he "sinned to the guilt of the people." Only for the sin of the whole people collectively the same offering was required. So it must ever be with those in positions of influence and authority; when they sin, they drag others with them into guiltiness. There is ever a federal, as well as an individual relation between man and God, and though the latter may determine his final condition, yet his individual relation itself is largely affected by his federal.

Sins of omission are regarded as sins equally with those of commission.

No one is so humble that the means of propitiation is not provided for him. Under the law this could only be symbolized by alternative offerings of different degrees, showing forth the freeness under the Gospel of the offer of the waters of life to all that are athirst.

E.—TRESPASS OFFERINGS.

CHAPS. V. 14—VI. 7.

NOTE.—In the division of chapters in the Hebrew Bible this section is rightly all included in Chap. V.

14, 15 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul commit a trespass [do a wrong[1]], and sin through ignorance [inadvertence[2]] in [*taking* from[3]] the holy things of the LORD; then he shall bring for his trespass unto the LORD a ram without blemish out of the flocks, with [according to[4]] thy estimation by shekels of silver,

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 15. תִּמְעֹל מָעַל. The word being different from the אָשַׁם so frequently recurring in this chapter in a technical sense, it is better to change the translation. Otherwise *commit a trespass* is a sufficiently good translation, as no English word embodies the idea of secrecy or stealth conveyed by the original.

[2] Ver. 15. בִּשְׁגָגָה = *through inadvertence.* See Note [1] on iv. 2.

[3] Ver. 15. מִקְדְּשֵׁי יי a *constructio prægnans* = taking, or diminishing from the holy things.

[4] Ver. 15. בְּעֶרְכְּךָ. The preposition often has the sense given in the A. V. *with* but *according to* (as in the next word but one) seems here the better rendering. The evident sense is that the ram was to be of a certain value, and this was to be determined by an estimation. The restitution for the harm done, with its added fifth, is prescribed in the following ver., and does not come into view here. The Sam. text preserves the exact form of the Hebrew, but all the ancient versions, while changing the form of expression, give the sense *according to;* they also neglect to translate the ךָ = thy.

16 after the shekel of the sanctuary, for a trespass offering; and he shall make amends
for the harm that he hath done [sin that he hath committed[5]] in the holy thing,
and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest: and the priest shall
make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering, and it shall be
forgiven him.

17 And if a soul sin, and commit any of these things which are forbidden to be done
by the commandments of the LORD; though he wist *it* not, yet is he guilty, and
18 shall bear his iniquity. And he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the
flock, with [according to[4]] thy estimation, for a trespass offering, unto the priest:
and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his ignorance [inadver-
19 tence[2]] wherein he erred and wist *it* not, and it shall be forgiven him. It *is* a tres-
pass offering: he hath certainly trespassed against the LORD.

CHAP. VI. 1, 2. AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, If a soul sin, and commit
a trespass [do a wrong[1]] against the LORD, and lie unto his neighbour, in that [and
deny to his neighbor that[6]] which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship [or a
pledge[7]] or in [*omit* in] a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived [op-
3 pressed[8]] his neighbour; or have found that which was lost, and lieth concerning
it [denieth it[6]] and sweareth falsely: in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning
4 therein: then it shall be, because he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall re-
store that which he took violently away, or the thing which he hath deceitfully
[oppressively[8]] gotten, or that which was delivered him to keep, or the lost thing
5 which he found, or all that about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even re-
store it in the principal, and shall add the fifth part more thereto, *and* give it unto
6 him to whom it appertaineth, in the day of his trespass offering.[9] And he shall
bring his trespass offering unto the LORD, a ram without blemish out of the flock,
7 with [according to[4]] thy estimation, for a trespass offering, unto the priest: and the
priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD: and it shall be forgiven
him for anything of all that he hath done in trespassing therein.

[5] Ver. 16. This is the only place in Lev. in which חטא is rendered by any other word than *sin* in the A. V. This should be conformed to the usage.

[6] Chap. VI. Ver. 2. כָּחַשׁ construed with a double ב of the person and of the thing, = to deny a thing to a person. The word means *to lie* (xix. 11, *etc.*), but the other rendering expresses more exactly the sense here, and is the more usual.

[7] Ver. 2. אוֹ־בִתְשׂוּמֶת יָד = *a thing given in pledge, a pawn*, different from the *trust* just before. The construction is with the same verb, and is sufficiently expressed without the special translation of ב, so that the *in* of the A. V. may be omitted throughout.

[8] Ver. 2. עָשַׁק lit. *to press, to squeeze*, hence *to oppress*. A new verb being here introduced the construction with the series of ב ends. The derived noun עֹשֶׁק, ver. 4, bears the same sense = that which has been *oppressively* obtained.

[9] Ver. 5. The Heb. word meaning either *trespass* or *trespass offering*, the marg. of the A. V. is hardly accurate in writing "Heb. in the day of his trespass."

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The general distinction of the trespass from the sin offering has already been pointed out: in the trespass offering the idea of the *harm done* was more prominent, in the sin offering that of the *sin committed*. Accordingly the trespass offering was usually accompanied by "amends for the harm"—a fifth (a double tithe) being added as penalty. In case the person against whom the wrong was done was already dead without a kinsman to receive the compensation, the amends and penalty were to be paid to the priest (Num. v. 8). The ritual differed in several respects from that of the sin offering: the blood was treated as in the burnt and peace offerings; the only victim here allowed was a ram; there was no gradation either in the victim or the ritual according to the rank of the offender; nor were any alternative offerings allowed in case of poverty. The reason for the last provision results necessarily from the nature of the offering. Elsewhere we find the same trespass offering prescribed for unchastity with a slave (xix. 20–22), and in later times offered by those who, on the return from the captivity, had taken strange wives (Ezra x. 19); the same also (not a "he-lamb," as in the A. V.) is commanded with a somewhat different ritual on occasion of declaring the cleansing of a leper (xiv. 12, 21), and also with a ram of a year old for the victim in case of unintentional defilement by a dead body during a Nazarite vow (Num. vi. 9–12).

Three cases are specified which demand a trespass offering—the first two having reference more directly to wrong done towards God (v. 15–19), and the third, including several varieties of offence, having reference to wrong done to men (vi. 2–7).

Ver. 14. **And the LORD spake.**—This formula marks a fresh communication and distinctly separates the trespass offering from the sin offering which has occupied the whole of the previous communication from iv. 1. The whole law of the trespass offering is not, however, contained in this communication, but only that part of it relating to wrongs done toward God. Wrongs done toward man are the subject of a separate communication (vi. 1-7).

Vers. 16-17. The first case of the trespass offering.

Ver. 15. **Through inadvertence,** as in iv. 2, 13, 22.

In taking from the holy things.—See Textual note 3. The holy things were the first-fruits, tithes, or gifts of any kind connected with the service of the sanctuary or the support of its priests, by the withholding of which the Lord is said to suffer loss. The restitution and penalty are mentioned xxii. 14 without mention of this offering, which is presupposed.

A ram.—The invariable trespass offering (except in the special cases xiv. 12; Num. vi. 12) which does not at all appear in the list of victims for the sin offering in iv. 1—v. 13.

According to thy estimation.—See Textual note 4.—The pronoun *thy* must be considered as used impersonally; or if it be taken personally, then it is addressed to Moses, and of course to any one to whom this duty should afterwards belong in his place.

Shekels.—The Vulg. and many commentators understand the plural to stand for *two*, as the A. V. has explained the plural in Ezek. xlvii. 13; others, as Aben-Ezra, Abarbanel, *etc.*, understand it less definitely as meaning at least two shekels. The notion of Oehler (p. 478) and Keil (*in loc.*) that the value of the ram was purposely left indefinite, that there might be room to vary it according to the gravity of the trespass, although advocated by Michaelis (Art. 244), is clearly wrong. It is opposed to the fundamental idea of all sacrifice, which excludes such correlation; and is entirely unnecessary, since the compensation and forfeit (ver. 16) were separately required. Moreover, the variation in the value of the ram would be very small in comparison with the variation in trespasses. The text was intended to fix the lowest limit of the value of a ram that could be allowed, and the estimation was for the purpose of determining whether he came up to the standard. "The plural is plainly to be understood as meaning two shekels, or at least two shekels." Knobel.

Shekel of the Sanctuary.—See Ex. xxx. 13; xxxviii. 24, *etc.*

Ver. 16. **And he shall make amends.**—He shall give the first-fruits or tithes, or whatever he had withheld or taken from sacred dues, or its value. **And shall add the fifth part thereto** as a penalty or forfeit.—Theodoret here refers to the example of Zaccheus. The justice of such additional payment is everywhere recognized in the Hebrew and all other laws. It is in this, and not in the ram, that the penalty is proportioned to the offence. This having been done, and reparation made, then, with the ram, **the priest shall make an atonement.**

On the ritual of this sacrifice see vii. 1-6.

Vers. 17–19. The second case of the trespass offering.

This second case probably differed from the first as sins of commission differ from those of omission. The formula by which the trespass is expressed is substantially the same as in iv. 22 and 27 in regard to the sin to be expiated by the sin offering. From its connection, and from its being expiated by the trespass offering, it is supposed to include all those transgressions against the theocratic law which could be compensated by money or other payment; yet in this case alone no mention is made of compensation, partly because it was evident from the foregoing that it was required when it could be given, and partly because it included also cases in which pecuniary compensation could not be given, but punishment must be inflicted in some other way. (See xix. 20.) Lange, however, urges that this omission is a serious difficulty against the view of the trespass offering which has here been given. He considers that the trespass offering relates to *participation* in guilt in contradistinction to an *original* offence, and thinks this is indicated by the description of these sins as "sins of ignorance." He says "these sins of ignorance belong specifically to the category of participation in guilt." It must be remembered, however, that *all* sins for which any offering was allowed were "sins of ignorance," or rather of inadvertence.

VI. 1–7. The third case of the trespass offering.

From the formula of ver. 1 this appears as a separate divine communication, on account of the different character of the sins enumerated. All sin is indeed against God, yet those which follow belong to that class of offences against Him which also work harm to men.

The first three verses contain an enumeration of specific wrongs; vers. 4 and 5 provide for amends for the harm done with the added penalty; and vers. 6 and 7 for atonement by means of the trespass offering. This communication bears the same relation to the foregoing which v. 1-13 bears to chap. iv.

Ver. 2. **If a man deny to his neighbor that which was delivered him.**—פִּקָּדוֹן is a deposit, a thing entrusted to be kept. The sin in this case would consist either in denying the receiving it at all, or denying that it was received in trust, or refusing to restore it.

A pledge.—This differs from the former in not being simply a trust, but a security, a pawn. It is not separately mentioned in ver. 4.

Ver. 3. **Sweareth falsely.**—When he denies that he has found a lost thing, and is put upon his oath, he swears to his lie, עַל-שָׁקֶר. This false swearing refers also to all the wrongs mentioned before, and the guilt of the false oath, added to the wrong done, brings the offence into the category of sins against the Lord.

Ver. 5. **In the day of his trespass offering.**—The amends for the wrong done was to be made to the person wronged at the same time that the offender sought the divine forgiveness. The penalty for the wrong and the ritual of the offering are the same as in chap. v.

In Ex. xxii. 1-9 a series of wrongs is enumerated much like those here mentioned with the

general law that the restitution should be double (vers. 4, 9), while in particular cases it rose to four and five-fold. The distinction between the penalty as given there and here appears to lie in the fact that there the offender was only brought to any restitution by a conviction "before the judges" (ver. 9); while here, although it is not distinctly so declared yet, every thing implies that the acknowledgment of the wrong is voluntary. There is no mention of conviction, and the whole connection is with sins of inadvertence or impulse which were afterwards acknowledged, and for which forgiveness was sought by the offender.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. From the law of the trespass offering it is clear that guilt was not removed by the mere act of compensation (with penalty added) for the harm done; nor, on the other hand, could an atonement be offered for that guilt until such compensation had been made. Here are brought out the two principles which everywhere, under the old and the new dispensation alike, are concerned in the forgiveness of transgression. There must be both the desire, as far as possible, to make amends for the harm done; and there must be also the sacrifice divinely appointed for "the covering" of the sin. Neither of these can avail alone, because both are essential to that state of holiness, that conquest over the evil, by which alone man can be at one with God. The sacrifice of Christ is all-sufficient for the forgiveness of sin; but the sinner can only avail himself of its benefits when, Christ-like, he himself seeks to conquer the evil.

II. Wrong done to man is itself sin against God. It is impossible to separate the command to love God from that of loving our neighbor also. 1 Jno. iii. 20, 21.

III. In those sins against others for which atonement was provided in the trespass offering, there was the additional sin of a false oath. This was certainly a moral offence—a sin in the full sense of the word. In view of this, it is impossible to look upon the offences for which sacrifices were appointed as mere ceremonial or theocratic offences. They everywhere appear as true sins, moral transgressions, and this is most clearly shown by including the false oath among them.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

There is no true repentance for wrong done to man which is not accompanied by restitution—and none for having taken from the things of the Lord, or for having failed to give all that should have been given to Him, except in restoring it in overflowing measure; yet while this may make amends for the *harm done*, forgiveness of the *sin* must still be sought through propitiation.

In the trespass offering the ritual of the blood was like that of the burnt or the peace offering—inferior to that of the sin offering. This shows that while wrong must of necessity involve sin, yet it does not, in itself considered, stand on the same footing as sin; the moral element in transgression is always the more important. One cannot indeed really offend against man without also offending against God; yet the offence which has God directly for its objective point must necessarily be more serious, since it involves a deeper tort than that which is directed only against man.

The sin offering was lessened by successive stages for the poor, and the very poor, that it might be brought within the reach of all; for all must have propitiation for sin; but the trespass offering is unvaried, the same for all; because if one cannot make amends for the wrong he has done, it must be let alone,—an inferior gift cannot set things right.

Wrong, like sin, may be committed through inadvertence. Still it must be atoned for. Good intentions will not repair the wrong.

For sin done "with a high hand," presumptuously, no sacrifice was provided, because the offender deliberately set himself in opposition to God; but for offences against man, such as those here enumerated, some of which must have been done deliberately, a sacrifice is allowed, because even such intentional wrongs do not constitute the same attitude of opposition to God. They may be done, through passion or covetousness, without reflection upon their moral bearings. Therefore, on repentance, restitution, and propitiation, they may be forgiven.

Origen applies the law of trespass in abstracting from sacred things to the faithfulness required of the Christian minister in regard to gifts for holy uses committed to his trust; and then further to the hearing of God's word as a sacred gift, for the use of which men are responsible, and for the misuse of which they become guilty.

SECOND SECTION.

Special Instructions chiefly for the Priests.

CHAP. VI. 8—VII. 38.

"*Standing Sacrificial Rites and Duties—especially of the Priests.*"—LANGE.

A.—FOR BURNT OFFERINGS.

CHAP. VI. 8–13.

8, 9 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Command[1] Aaron and his sons, saying, This *is* the law of the burnt offering: It[2] *is* the burnt offering, because of the burning upon the altar [This, the burnt offering, *shall be* upon the hearth upon the altar[3]] all night unto the morning, and the fire of the altar shall be burning in it.
10 And the priest shall put on his[4] linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put[5] upon his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire hath consumed with the burnt offering [ashes to which the fire hath consumed the burnt-offering[6]] on the altar,
11 and he shall put them beside the altar. And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the camp unto a clean
12 place.[7] And the fire upon the altar shall be burning in [on] it; it shall not be put out: and the priest shall burn wood on it every morning, and lay the burnt offering in order upon it: and he shall burn thereon the fat of the peace offerings.
13 The fire shall ever be burning upon the altar; it shall never go out.

B.—FOR OBLATIONS (MEAT OFFERINGS). VI. 14–23.

14 And this *is* the law of the meat offering [oblation[8]]; the sons of Aaron shall
15 offer[9] it before the LORD, before the altar. And he shall take of it his handful, of the flour of the meat offering [oblation[8]], and of the oil thereof, and all the frankincense which *is* upon the meat offering [oblation[8]], and shall burn *it* upon the
16 altar *for* a sweet savour, *even* the memorial of it, unto the LORD. And the remainder thereof shall Aaron and his sons eat: with [*om.* with] unleavened bread [*om.* bread] shall it be eaten in the [a] holy place; in the court of the tabernacle of the
17 [*om.* the] congregation they shall eat it. It[2] shall not be baken with leaven. I have given it *unto them for* their portion of my offerings made by fire; it *is* most

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 9. צַו. The Sam. has צְוֵי, a form which occurs in MSS. with the pointing צַוֵּי.

[2] Vers. 9, 17, 18, 22. הוּא. The Sam. and many MSS. have the later form הִיא indicated by the Masoretic punctuation. This frequent variation will not hereafter be noticed. The conjectural emendation of Houbigant, הֲוֵי in the imperative, although expressing the sense, is unnecessary.

[3] Ver. 9. The suggested translation is that given by most critics; of its general correctness there can be no doubt; but the sense of מוֹקְדָה (which occurs only here) may be either that of *hearth*, or of *burning*. The masculine form, מוֹקֵד (which is found only Ps. cii. 4 (3), and Isa. xxxiii. 14), is translated in both ways in the A. V., but should have only the latter sense. The weight of authority as well as the context make *hearth* the preferable translation here. Knobel would make הוּא the verb *to be* in the imperative; but this is not sufficiently supported.

[4] Ver. 10. מִדּוֹ. For the suffix on a noun in the constr. Knobel refers to xxvi. 42; Ex. xxvi. 25; Jer. ix. 2 (viii. 23); 2 Sam. xxii. 33, however, reads מִדַּי.

[5] Ver. 10. The Sam. for יִלְבַּשׁ has יְהִיוּ as in xvi. 4, which scarcely affects the sense.

[6] Ver. 10. The propriety of this correction is obvious. Bp. Horsley's emendation: *take up the ashes of the fire which hath consumed*—does violence to the Heb.

[7] Ver. 11. The Vulg. has this curious addition: *usque ad favillam consumi faciet.*

[8] Ver. 14, *etc.* מִנְחָה=oblation. See ch. ii. 1, Text. and Gram. Note (2). The Sam. has here "the law of the oblation of the drink offerings," whence the Vulg.: *lex sacrificii et libamentorum.*

[9] Ver. 14. הַקְרֵב, Infin. Abs. as in ii. 6; Ex. xiii. 3.

18 holy, as *is* the sin offering, and as the trespass offering. All the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it. *It shall be* a statute forever in your generations concerning the offerings of the LORD made by fire: every one that [whatsoever[10]] toucheth them shall be holy.

19, 20 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, This *is* the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer unto the LORD in the day when he[11] is anointed; the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for[12] a meat offering [an oblation[8]] perpetual,
21 half of it in the morning, and half thereof at night.[13] In a pan it shall be made with oil; *and when it is* baken [fried[14]], thou shalt bring it in: *and* the baken[15] pieces[15] of the meat-offering [oblation[8]] shalt thou offer *for* a sweet savour unto the
22 LORD. And the priest of his sons that is anointed in his stead shall offer it: *it is*
23 a statute forever unto the LORD; it shall be wholly burnt. For every meat-offering [oblation[8]] for the priest shall be wholly burnt: it shall not be eaten.

C.—FOR SIN OFFERINGS. VI. 24–30.

24, 25 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, saying, This *is* the law of the sin offering: In the place where the burnt offering is
26 killed shall the sin offering be killed before the LORD: it *is* most holy. The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in the [a] holy place shall it be eaten, in the
27 court of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation. Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall be holy: and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof upon any garment, thou[16] shalt wash that whereon it was sprinkled in the [a] holy place.
28 But the earthen vessel wherein it is sodden shall be broken: and if it be sodden in
29 a brazen pot, it shall be both scoured, and rinsed in water. All the males among
30 the priests shall eat thereof: it *is* most holy. And [But] no sin offering, whereof *any* of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation to reconcile [make atonement[17]] *withal* in the holy *place,* shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire.

D.—FOR TRESPASS OFFERINGS. CHAP. VII. 1–6.

CHAP. VII. 1 Likewise [And] this *is* the law of[18] the trespass-offering: it *is* most
2 holy. In the place where they kill the burnt offering shall they kill the trespass offering: and the blood thereof shall he[19] sprinkle round about upon the altar.
3 And he shall offer of it all the fat thereof; the rump [the fat tail[20]], and the fat that
4 covereth the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* on them, which *is* by the flanks, and the caul *that is* above the liver, with [on[21]] the kidneys, it shall
5 he take away: and the priest shall burn them upon the altar *for* an offering made
6 by fire unto the LORD; it *is* a trespass offering. Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it shall be eaten in the [a] holy place: it *is* most holy.

[10] Ver. 18. כֹּל אֲשֶׁר might be understood either as *every one that*, as in the A. V., or as *every thing that;* but as the latter is the necessary translation of the exactly parallel clause in ver. 27 (as in the A. V.), it is better to keep it here also.

[11] Ver. 20. The Syr. here has the plural.

[12] Ver. 20. The prep. לְ, not in the Heb., is supplied by the Sam. and many MSS.

[13] Ver. 20. The paraphrase of the Sam. בֵּין הָעַרְבַּיִם=*between the evenings*, expresses the connection of this oblation with the evening sacrifice.

[14] Ver. 21. מֻרְבֶּכֶת, a word of very doubtful meaning, but should certainly have the same translation as in vii. 12, where see note.

[15] Ver. 21. תְּפִינֵי, a word ἁπ. λεγ. to which different significations are attached according to its supposed derivation. Fürst, deriving it from תָּוַךְ, gives the sense of the A. V. Gesenius also, deriving from אָפָה, gives the sense of *cooked.* Others derive it from an Arabic root, and give the meaning *broken.* So Targ. Onk. (which points תְּוִפֵּינֵי) and the Sam.

[16] Ver. 27. עָלִיהּ תִּכְבֶּס. The sudden change of person, and the feminine suffix in reference to a masculine noun, are both avoided by the Sam. reading עֲלֵיו יִכְבֹּס.

[17] Ver. 30. לְכַפֵּר. There may be but little difference in the sense of the two renderings; but it is better to retain the same form always. Other instances of variation in the A. V. in Lev. are viii. 15 and xvi. 20 only.

[18] VII. Ver. 1. The LXX. here has ὁ νόμος τοῦ κριοῦ, the ram being the only victim admissible for the trespass offering.

[19] Ver. 2. The Sam. here uses the plural. It cannot mean that the offerer sprinkled the blood, but rather assimilates this verb to those going before on the supposition (as in i. 6, 12, *etc.*) that the priests also killed the victim.

[20] Ver. 3. הָאַלְיָה. See Textual Note [4] on iii. 9.

[21] Ver. 4. עַל=*on.* See Textual Note [7] on iii. 4.

E.—FOR THE PRIESTS' PORTION OF THE ABOVE OFFERINGS. VII. 7–10.

7 As the sin-offering *is*, so *is* the trespass offering: *there is* one law for them: the
8 priest that maketh atonement therewith shall have *it*. And the priest that offer-
eth any man's burnt offering, *even* the priest shall have to himself the skin of the
9 burnt-offering which he hath offered. And all the meat-offering [oblation[8]] that is
baken in the oven, and all that is dressed in the frying-pan [pot[22]], and in the pan,
10 shall be the priest's that offereth it. And [But] every meat offering [oblation[8]]
mingled with oil, and dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have, one *as much* as another.

F.—FOR PEACE OFFERINGS IN THEIR VARIETY. VII. 11–21.

11 And this *is* the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which he[23] shall offer unto
12 the LORD. If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice
of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed
13 with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine flour, fried.[24] Besides the cakes, he
shall offer *for* his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of thanksgiving of his
14 peace offerings. And of it he shall offer one out of the whole oblation [out of each
offering[25]] *for* an heave offering unto the LORD, *and* it shall be the priest's that
15 sprinkleth the blood of the peace offerings. And the flesh of the sacrifice of his
peace offerings for thanksgiving shall be eaten the same day that it is offered; he
16 shall not leave any of it until the morning. But if the sacrifice of his offering *be*
a vow, or a voluntary offering, it shall be eaten the same day that he offereth his
17 sacrifice: and on the morrow also the remainder of it shall be eaten: but the re-
mainder of the flesh of the sacrifice on the third day shall be burnt with fire.
18 And if *any* of the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offerings be eaten at all on the
third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offer-
eth it: it shall be an abomination,[26] and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his
19 iniquity. And the flesh that toucheth any unclean *thing* shall not be eaten; it
shall be burnt with fire: and as for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof.
20 But the soul that eateth *of* the flesh of the sacrifice of peace offerings that *pertain*
unto the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him, even that soul shall be cut off
21 from his people. Moreover the soul that shall touch any unclean *thing*, *as* the
uncleanness of man, or *any* unclean beast, or any abominable unclean *thing*,[27] and
eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which *pertain* unto the LORD, even
that soul shall be cut off from his people.

G.—FOR THE FAT AND THE BLOOD. VII. 22–27.

22, 23 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel,
24 saying, Ye shall eat no manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat. And the fat
of the beast [carcase[28]] that dieth of itself, and the fat of that which is torn with
25 beasts, may be used in any other use: but ye shall in no wise eat of it. For who-
soever eateth the fat of the beast, of which men offer an offering made by fire unto

[22] Ver. 9. See Textual Note [7] on ii. 7.

[23] Ver. 11. The Sam., LXX. and Vulg. with two MSS. have the plural.

[24] Ver. 12. מִרְבֶּכֶת. There is so much difference of opinion as to the meaning that it seems unsafe to attempt any change in the A. V. Fürst says: "*something dipped in, mingled* (by moistening);" Lange denies that it conveys the sense of cooked; Keil translates "*and roasted fine flour* (see vi. 14) *mixed as cakes with oil, i. e.*, cakes made of fine flour roasted with oil, and thoroughly kneaded with oil." Others give varying interpretations.

[25] Ver. 14. קָרְבָּן is to be uniformly translated *offering*. See ii. 1. The word *whole* in the A. V. does not express the idea that one must be taken out of each of the offerings mentioned in the two preceding verses.

[26] Ver. 18. פִּגּוּל occurs only here and in xix. 7; Isa. lxv. 4; Ezek. iv. 14, and is always applied to the sacrificial flesh. It is from the root פָּגַל, and signifies something unclean and fetid, LXX. *μίασμα*.

[27] Ver. 21. For שִׁקֻּץ=*an abominable animal* (xi. 10, 12, 13, 20, 23, 41), the Sam., six MSS. of Kennicott and of de Rossi, Targ. of Onkelos (רִחְשׁ) and the Syr. read שְׁרִץ=*reptiles, worms* (v. xi. 20, 29, 41). This would make a more systematic enumeration of the sources of uncleanness, and is adopted by many.

[28] Ver. 24. נְבֵלָה. The margin of the A. V. is better than the text. The טְרֵפָה of the next clause=*torn sc.* of beasts, is of course a wholly different word.

26 the LORD, even the soul that eateth *it* shall be cut off from his people. Moreover
ye shall eat no manner of blood, *whether it be* of fowl or of beast, in any of your
27 dwellings. Whatsoever soul *it be* that eateth any manner of blood, even that soul
shall be cut off from his people.

H.—FOR THE PRIESTS' PORTION OF THE PEACE OFFERINGS. VII. 28–36.

28, 29 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel,
saying, He that offereth the sacrifice of his peace offerings unto the LORD shall
bring his oblation [offering[29]] unto the LORD of the sacrifice of his peace offerings.
30 His own hands shall bring the offerings of the LORD made by fire, the fat with the
breast, it shall he bring, that the breast may be waved *for* a wave offering before
31 the LORD. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar: but the breast shall
32 be Aaron's and his sons'. And the right shoulder [leg[30]] shall ye give unto the priest
33 *for* an heave offering of the sacrifices of your peace offerings. He among the sons of
Aaron, that offereth the blood of the peace offerings, and the fat, shall have the right
34 shoulder [leg[30]] for *his* part. For the wave-breast and the heave shoulder [leg[30]] have
I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace offerings, and
have given them unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons by a statute for ever from
35 among the children of Israel. This *is the portion* of the anointing of Aaron, and
of the anointing of his sons [This is the portion[31] of Aaron and the portion[31] of his
sons], out of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, in the day *when* he[32] presented
36 them to minister unto the LORD in the priest's office; which the LORD commanded
to be given them of the children of Israel, in the day that he anointed them, *by* a
statute forever throughout their generations.

CONCLUSION OF THIS SECTION. VII. 37–38.

37 This *is* the law of the burnt offering, of the meat offering [oblation], and of the
sin offering, and of the trespass offering, and of the consecrations, and of the sacri-
38 fice of the peace offerings; which the LORD commanded Moses in Mount Sinai, in
the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations [offerings[29]]
unto the LORD, in the wilderness of Sinai.

[29] Ver. 29. The uniform translation of קָרְבָּן must be retained here also, although giving an appearance of tautology which is not in the original, *his peace offerings* being expressed simply by שְׁלָמָיו. The translation of the A. V. may have been influenced by the rendering in the Vulg.: *offerat simul et sacrificium, id est, libamenta ejus*; but for this there is no warrant, nor is it sustained by any other of the ancient versions.

[30] Ver. 32. שׁוֹק is uniformly rendered *shoulder* in the A. V. wherever it is applied to sacrificial animals; in all other places it is used of men (Deut. xxviii. 35; Prov. xxvi. 7; Cant. v. 15; Isa. xlvii. 2; also Dan. ii. 33, Chald.; Ps. cxlvii. 10), and is translated *leg*, or *hip*, or *thigh*. The A. V. has here followed the equally uniform practice of the LXX. and the Vulg. It would seem that the word should have the same sense in both cases; there is no place in which *leg* is inapplicable, but there are several in which *shoulder* is inadmissible. The testimony of Josephus (III. 9, § 2, κνήμη) is explicit in favor of *leg*; so also Jewish tradition and the lexicons. Whether the fore or the hind leg is meant is a matter of difference of opinion; but the Heb. has a distinct word זְרוֹעַ=*arm* for the shoulder or fore-leg (Num. vi. 19; Deut. xviii. 3), and that, too, of the sacrificial animals.

[31] Ver. 35. מִשְׁחָה. The word undoubtedly means *anointing*; but there is also good authority for the meaning *portion* which Rosenmüller considers undoubtedly the right translation here, and which is so necessary to the sense that it is supplied in the A. V., which has followed the translation of the LXX. and Vulg.

[32] Ver. 35. The Vulg. has *die qua obtulit eos Moyses ut sacerdotio fungerentur*.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The remainder of ch. vi., with the whole of ch. vii., form a distinct section occupied mainly with the duties and privileges of the priests in connection with their sacrificial service. Although there is unavoidably a little repetition in thus speaking again of the same sacrifices from a different point of view and for a different object; yet the gain in clearness and distinctness in thus separating the priestly duties from those of the laymen is obvious, both for the priests and for the people. The section consists of five divine communications addressed through Moses to **Aaron and his sons**, as the former communication had been to **the children of Israel.**

It has already been noticed that in the Hebrew Bibles the chapter rightly begins with the beginning of this section. Here also begins a new *Parashah*, or Proper Lesson of the law, which extends to viii. 36. The corresponding Lesson from the prophets begins with Jer. vii. 21, in which "God declares the vanity of sacrifice without obedience."

A. Vers. 8-13. Instructions for the priests in regard to the burnt-offerings. This has reference to the daily burnt-offerings of a lamb at

evening and at morning. There was no occasion for directions in regard to the voluntary burnt offerings as they involved no other priestly duties than those already expressed in chap. i.; in that chapter nothing has been said of the required burnt sacrifice, provided at the public cost, which is here treated of.

Ver. 9. **All night unto the morning.**—The slow fire of the evening sacrifice was to be so arranged as to last until the morning; that of the morning sacrifice was ordinarily added to by other offerings, or if not, could easily be made to last through the much shorter interval until the evening. The evening sacrifice is naturally mentioned first because, in the Hebrew division of time, this was the beginning of the day. It was offered "between the evenings," *i. e.*, between three o'clock and the going down of the sun. The general direction for the daily burnt offerings has already been given in Ex. xxix. 38, and is again repeated in Num. xxviii. 3. As this offering was theoretically the comprehensive type from which all other offerings were specialized, so practically it was always burning upon the altar, and all other sacrifices were offered "upon it."

Ver. 10. **His linen garment.**—This was "the long tight-robe of fine white linen, or byssus, without folds, covering the whole body, and reaching down to the feet, with sleeves, woven as one entire piece, and with forms of squares intermixed, and hence called tesalated" (Kalisch). It is scarcely necessary to point out that linen, from its cleanliness, and from the readiness with which it could be washed, was selected as the priestly dress not only among the Israelites, but among many other nations also, especially the Egyptians, whose priests are therefore often described by Roman poets as *linigeri*. There were four parts of the priestly linen dress, of which two only are mentioned here, because all had been prescribed in Ex. xxviii. 40-43, and the girdle and the turban were of course to be understood. The priests might not minister at the altar in any other garments, nor might they wear these outside the sacred precincts.

And take up the ashes.—As the priest must be in his official dress at the altar, it was of necessity that he should temporarily deposit the ashes near by, until he had finished the ordering of the altar.

Ver. 11. **And he shall put off his garments.**—The sacred dress was now to be laid aside as the priest must pass out of the tabernacle and out of the camp. It has been questioned whether the carrying forth of the ashes must necessarily be performed by the officiating priest himself. According to Jewish tradition it might be done by any of the priestly family who were excluded from officiating at the altar by reason of some bodily defect. The same tradition also tells us that it was only required each day to carry forth a small quantity of the ashes—a shovel-full—allowing the rest to remain until the hollow of the altar below the grating was filled up, when all must be emptied and carried away.

Unto a clean place.—There was a fitness too evident to require further reason, that the remains of what had been used for the holiest purposes should be deposited in a clean place.

—Without the camp, is a phrase belonging to the life of the wilderness, but easily modified to the requirements of the settled life in Palestine.

Ver. 12. **Shall burn wood on it.**—The fire was to be maintained always whether the previous sacrifice remained burning sufficiently or not, so that fresh supplies of wood were to be added. Great care was taken in the selection and preparation of this wood, and any sticks worm-eaten were rejected. **And lay the burnt-offering.**—All was to be arranged and the fire brightly burning before the time of offering the morning sacrifice. When this was laid upon the wood, the sacrificial day was begun, and **the fat of the peace-offerings** and any other sacrifices that might be presented were placed upon it.

Ver. 13. **The fire shall be ever burning upon the altar.**—The fire upon the altar was not, as is sometimes supposed, originally kindled by the "fire from before the LORD" (ix. 24), since it had been burning several days before that fire came forth; yet that fire so marked the Divine approbation of the priestly order as they entered upon their office, that a continual fire in which that was always in a sense perpetuated, was a constant symbol and pledge of the Divine acceptance of the sacrifices offered upon it. So also, in later times, with the fire from heaven at the dedication of the temple (2 Chr. vii. 1). But besides this, "It is evident that the fire burning continually, which was kept up by the daily burnt offering (Ex. xxix. 38), had a symbolical meaning. As the daily burnt sacrifice betokened the daily renewed gift of God, in like manner did this continually burning fire denote the unceasing, uninterrupted character of the same. Similar customs with the heathen had a different signification. Among the Persians (and among the Parsees in India at this day), fire was and is the visible representative of the Godhead; the continual burning of it, the emblem of eternity. The perpetual fire of Vesta (the "oldest goddess") among the Greeks and Romans, was the emblem of the inmost, purest warmth of life, which unites family and people—the hearth, as it were, the heart of a house or of a State. In both is shown the essential difference which existed between these and the Divine covenant religion." Von Gerlach. Perpetual sacrificial fires were common among many ancient nations.

It is obvious that during the marches of the life in the wilderness some special means must have been used for the preservation of this fire. On such occasions the altar was to be carefully cleaned and covered with a purple cloth and then with "badgers' skins." (Num. iv. 13, 14). Probably the fire was carried on the march in a vessel prepared for the purpose.

B. Instructions for the priests concerning oblations. This division consists of two portions, the former of which (vers. 14-18) is a part of the same divine communication as the preceding division, and relates to the priestly duties connected with the oblations of the people, whether voluntary or required; while the latter, (vers. 19-23), forms a separate divine communication, and relates to the special oblation of the high-priests themselves in connection with their consecration.

The law of the oblation is a repetition in part of that in ch. ii., because it was there applied only to voluntary oblations, while here it includes all; but there are also (in vers. 16-18) additional particulars not given before.

Ver. 14. **The sons of Aaron shall offer it.**—This presentation of the whole oblation by the priests, which seems to have been an essential part of the sacrifice, has been already mentioned in ch. ii. 8, while ver. 15 merely repeats and applies to all oblations the directions in ii. 2 for the private and voluntary oblation.

Ver. 16. The following directions, which concern the duties of the priests, have not before been given. By their consuming the remainder of the oblation it became, like the sin-offering, a sacrifice wholly devoted to the Lord. See note on ii. 3. Only those of Aaron's sons might eat of it who were ceremonially clean. This is expressed emphatically in regard to the peace offerings in vii. 21. The addition of the words *with* and *bread* in the A. V. singularly obscures the sense; it should be read **unleavened shall it be eaten in a holy place.**

Ver. 17. **I have given it.**—Not merely by appointment, as God is the giver of all that man enjoys; but **of my offerings**, as of that which peculiarly belonged to God.—**Most holy.** See on ii. 3.

Ver. 18. **All the males.**—Because they, and they only, were in the priestly succession. It includes both those who were actual priests, and their sons yet too young to officiate, but who at the proper age would become priests; and still further, those who were of priestly family, but were hindered by bodily defect or infirmity from ministering at the altar. **Whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.**—Two senses are possible: (a) nothing shall be allowed to touch them which is not holy; (b) whatever does touch them shall thereby become holy. The latter must be considered the true sense in accordance with the analogy of vers. 27, 28, and Ex. xxix. 37, (comp. Hag. ii. 12, 13), and with this sense the command, understood of inanimate objects, as Calmet suggests, presents no difficulty. The LXX. and Vulg., however, (not the Semitic versions which of course present the same ambiguity as the Heb.), like the A. V., understood it of persons, and so understood, it has occasioned much difficulty to commentators. Lange, following Theodoret, says "Whoever should touch this most holy flesh offering (and more especially the meat offering) should be holy, should henceforward be considered to belong to the Sanctuary." He then gives various differing interpretations. It is better to avoid the difficulty altogether as above.

Ver. 20. **In the day when he is anointed.**—The new communication in relation to the high-priest's oblation begins with ver. 19. Most commentators understand the time when this oblation was to be offered as at the end of the seven days of consecration, as the high-priest was only then qualified to officiate. The word *day* would then be understood as in Gen. ii. 4. Lange, however, says "on each of the seven days, not only on the eighth day, when the consecration was finished (ch. viii. 34) this was to be offered." **An oblation perpetual.**—A few interpreters (as Kalish and Knobel) understand this of an observance to be always repeated at the consecration of each successive high-priest, and then only. More generally it is interpreted as referring to a daily oblation always to be offered morning and evening by the high-priest. Such is the uniform Jewish interpretation. It is probably this offering that is referred to in Ecclus. xlv. 14; see also Philo, *de Vict.* Jos. *Ant.* iii. ch. 10 § 7. Several eminent Jewish authorities, as Maimonides and Abarbanel, have supposed that the same offering was also required of every priest at his entrance upon his office; but this opinion, as it has not been widely adopted, so it seems to have no foundation in the law. The high-priest alone is distinctly designated in ver. 22.

The tenth part of an Ephah.—The same amount which was required for the sin offering of the poorest of the people in v. 11. This amount was to be presented by the high-priest as a single offering which was to be afterwards divided and offered half in the morning and half at night.

Ver. 23. **It shall not be eaten.**—In other oblations all was given to God, but in part through the priest; in the priestly oblation, he could not offer it to God through himself, and therefore it must of necessity be **wholly burnt.**

C. Instructions for the priests concerning sin offerings.

Lange adheres to the view he has given in ch. iv., and makes this division include both the sin and the trespass offerings. For his reasons see ch. iv. He, however, calls the next division "The ritual of the trespass offering."

We have here the third of the five divine communications contained in this section. The first includes the burnt offerings and oblations, while the second, as an appendix to this, is occupied with the special oblations of the high-priest; the present communication extends to vii. 21, and embraces the directions to the priests concerning the various other kinds of sacrifice. In the order in which they are mentioned in chs. iii.—v. the peace offerings came before the sin and trespass offerings, while here they are placed after them; the reason for this change is well explained by Murphy, as resulting from the different principle of arrangement appropriate in the two cases. In the instructions for the people the order of the sacrifices is that of their comparative frequency, the burnt offering and oblation being constant (although not so as voluntary offerings), the peace offerings habitual, the sin and trespass offerings, from their nature, occasional; here the principle of arrangement is in the treatment of the flesh,—the burnt offering, (with which the oblation is associated) was wholly consumed on the altar, the sin and trespass offerings were partly eaten by the priests, the peace-offerings both by the priests and the people.

Ver. 25. **In the place where the burnt offering.**—It is evident from ver. 30 that this whole direction refers to the sin offerings of the people, not of the high-priest or of the whole congregation. These were to be killed in the usual place of killing the smaller sacrificial animals, on the north side of the altar. See note

on i. 11. The sin offering for the high-priest and for the congregation, consisting of a bullock, was to be killed (i. 3) where the bullock for burnt offering was killed "before the door of the tabernacle." See note on i. 3.

It is most holy.—See on ii. 3.

Ver. 25. **The priest that offereth it.**—For the exceptions see ver. 30. The flesh of the ordinary sin-offering belonged, not to the priests as a body, but to the particular priest that offered it. It was, however, much more than he could consume alone, and therefore in ver. 29 all males of the priestly family were allowed to eat of it, doubtless on the invitation of the officiating priest, or by some established arrangement.

Ver. 27. **Shall be holy.**—As in ver. 18. In regard to the peculiarly sacred character of the sin offering Lange says, "the complete surrender to Jehovah is expressed in three ways: 1) Forbidding the flesh to the unclean;" [But this, although to be supposed, is not mentioned here, whereas it is very emphatically commanded in connection with the peace offerings, vii. 20, 21]. "2) Washing the garments sprinkled with blood in a holy place, or in the court. Here the regard is not for the cleansing of the garment, but for the blood,—it must not be carried on the garment out of the sanctuary; 3) If the vessel in which the flesh was cooked was earthen, it had to be broken, if of copper, it had to be scoured and rinsed, so that nothing of the substance of the flesh should remain sticking to it." On the reason for the peculiar sacredness with which the flesh of the sin offering was regarded various opinions have been held. It seems unnecessary, however, to look for this reason in the supposition that the victim was regarded as bearing either the sins of the offerer, or the punishment due to those sins. The simple fact that God had appointed the sin-offering as a means whereby sinfulness might "be covered," and sinful man might approach Him in His perfect holiness, is enough to invest that means, like the altar upon which it was offered, with a sacredness which needs no analysis for its explanation. The very important passage, ch. x. 17, usually referred to in this connection, will be treated of in its place.

Thou shalt wash.—The second person is used because the command is addressed to the priest. The garment referred to is probably that of the offerer; it might easily happen that this would sometimes be stained by the spurting of the blood of the victim, but he was not to wash it himself; no particle of the blood might be carried out of the sanctuary, and none might meddle with it but the divinely appointed priest.

Ver. 28. **But the earthen vessel.**—Unglazed earthenware would absorb the juices of the flesh so that they could not be removed; hence such vessels must be broken that the flesh of the sin offering might not be profaned. The **brazen pot** probably stands for any metallic vessel, and these being less porous, might be perfectly freed from the flesh by scouring and rinsing. For the same reason the earthen vessel into which any of the small unclean animals when dead had fallen (xi. 33, 35), must be broken; from its absorptive qualities it took the character of that which had been within it, and was unfit for other use. No direction is given for the disposition of the broken fragments. It is more likely that they were disposed of with the ashes from the altar, than that, as Jewish tradition affirms, the earth opened to swallow them up. No mention is made of any other method of cooking the flesh of the sacrifice than by boiling. From 1 Sam. ii. 13-15, and from the allusion in Zech. xiv. 21, it would appear that the same method was observed also in later ages.

Ver. 29. **All the males.**—Comp. Note on ver. 18.

Ver. 30. **But no sin offering whereof any of the blood is brought in the tabernacle.**—Comp. iv. 5-7, 11, 12, 16-18, 21; xvi. 27. This shows that from the foregoing directions the sin offerings for the high-priest and for the whole congregation are to be excepted; for these no directions are here given, since the priest had nothing more to do with them than has already been provided for in ch. iv.

D. Instructions for the priests concerning trespass offerings. vii. 1-6.

In the LXX. this and the next division (vii. 7-10) form a part of ch. vi. This is certainly the better division; but the A. V. has here followed the Hebrew, as in the division between chaps. v. and vi., it followed the LXX.—in both cases for the worse.

In the former directions for the trespass offering (v. 14—vi. 7) designed for the people, nothing is said of what parts are to be burned on the altar, nor of the disposal of the remainder. The directions on these points are now given to the priests. The ritual is precisely the same as for the ordinary sin-offering except in the treatment of the blood. This was to be treated as that of the burnt and of the peace offerings, viz. to be sprinkled on the sides of the altar, instead of being placed on its horns as in the sin offering. See iii. 2, 8, 13; iv. 6, 30, 34. The *Codex Middoth* (iii. 1) is quoted for the tradition of the Jews that there was a scarlet thread or line around the altar just at the middle of its height; and that the blood of the burnt offering was sprinkled above, and that of the trespass offering below this line. No mention is made of laying on of hands in the trespass offering, either here or in v. 14—vi. 7 (where it would more naturally occur). Knobel argues from this omission that it was omitted in this offering; it is more likely that there is no mention of it because it was a universal law in the case of all victims and therefore did not require to be specified.

Ver. 3. **The fat tail** is specified because the victim in the trespass offering must always be a ram. For other points see ch. iii.

E. Instructions concerning the priests' portion of the above. vii. 7-10.

Before proceeding to those sacrifices, of which a part was returned to be consumed by the offerer, summary directions are now given in regard to all the preceding offerings, which were wholly devoted to the Lord, whether by being wholly consumed upon the altar, or partly eaten by the priests.

Ver. 7. **One law for them**—*i. e.*, in respect to the matter here treated of, the disposal of their flesh. **The priest that maketh atonement.**

—The flesh of these victims did not become the common property of the priestly body, but was the peculiar perquisite of the officiating priest. He might, of course, ask others, and especially those who were hindered by bodily infirmity from officiating, to share it with him.

Ver. 8. **Shall have to himself the skin.**—Since this was unsuitable for burning upon the altar, and yet the victim was wholly devoted. No directions are any where given in regard to the skins of the other offerings, except those which were to be burned with the flesh without the camp. The *Mishna* (Sebach 12, 3) says that the skins of all victims designated as "most holy" were given to the priests, while those of other victims (*i. e.*, the peace offerings in their variety) belonged to the offerer. This distinction, being in accordance with the character of the sacrifice, is probably true. Among the heathen, the skin of the sacrificial animals usually belonged to the priest, and was by them often perverted to superstitious uses. See Patrick, Kalisch, and others. Some commentators trace the origin of the custom in regard to the burnt offering back to Adam; it rather lies still further back in the nature of the sacrifice.

Ver. 9. **And all the oblation.**—Except, of course, the "memorial," which was burned upon the altar, and which having been carefully provided for in chap. ii., did not require to be specified in this brief summary. In this verse all cooked oblations are assigned to the officiating priest; while in the next all that are uncooked are given to the priestly body equally. The former included all the oblations of ii. 4–10, and it is generally supposed that even these required to be consumed without delay; the latter include the oblations of ii. 1, and probably that of ii. 15; also the alternative sin offering of v. 11, and the jealousy offering of Num. v. 15. Only the two latter come under the class of dry, the others being **mingled with oil.** Thus all oblations, except that of the thank offering (vii. 14) and the "memorial" in all cases, was in one way or the other consumed by the priests. A secondary object in the assignment of these sacrifices was the support of the priests. See Ezek. xliv. 29.

F. Instructions for the priests in regard to the peace offerings in their variety, vii. 11-21.

For the reason why the peace offerings are here placed last, see note on vi. 24.

We here enter upon an entirely different kind of sacrifice from those which have gone before, and therefore there is a different ritual. The former had reference to the means of approach to God through the forgiveness of sin; these are more closely connected with the idea of continued communion with God, and hence, so far as their object is concerned, seem to belong more properly to the second part of the book. Nevertheless, for the purpose of law, the stronger connection is, as sacrifices, with the general laws of sacrifice, and hence they must necessarily be placed here. Moreover, they are not to be considered altogether by themselves, but, as Outram has noted, as generally following piacular sacrifices, and therefore as together with them forming the complete act of worship.

The peace offerings might be of any animal allowed for sacrifice (except birds which were too small for the accompanying feast) as is provided in chap. iii. They might be of either the herd or the flock, and either male or female. No limitation of age is given in the law, although Jewish tradition limits the age of those offered from the herd to from one to three years, and of those from the flock to from one to two years complete. On the place for the killing of the victims, see note on i. 11. Historical examples of these offerings are very frequent in the later books, *e. g.*, 1 Sam. i. 4; ix. 13, 24; xi. 15; xvi. 3, 5; 1 Kings viii. 65; 1 Chron. xvi. 3, *etc.* Similar sacrificial feasts among the heathen are familiar to all readers of Homer.

Three varieties of the peace offering are distinguished, or rather two principal kinds, the second of which is again subdivided—(*a*) The thank offering, vers. 12-15, which included all the public and prescribed peace offerings; (*b*) the (1) vow, or (2) voluntary offering, vers. 16-18, both of which were sacrifices of individuals. The two kinds were broadly separated from one another by the length of time during which it was lawful to eat the flesh, while the sub-varieties of the second kind are only distinguished in the purpose of the offerer. "There are three possible forms in which man can offer with reference to his prosperity or safety: praise and thanksgiving for experiences in the past; promising in regard to a desire in the future; expression of thankful prosperity in the present." Lange.

Vers. 12-15. The thank offering.

Ver. 12. The thank offering was accompanied by an oblation of three kinds, to which a fourth was added (ver. 13) of leavened bread, which last is perhaps to be considered as an accompaniment rather than a part of the offering, as it is doubtful whether it is included in the "heave offering" of ver. 14. Still, as none of this oblation was placed upon the altar, the leavened bread would not come under the prohibition of ii. 11 and of Ex. xxiii. 18; xxxiv. 25. The drink offerings prescribed with this and other sacrifices in Num. xv. (and alluded to in Lev. xxiii. 18, 37) as to be offered "when ye be come into the land of your habitation," are not mentioned here, probably because they were not easily obtained during the life in the wilderness. The abundance of bread of various kinds here required was in view of the sacrificial meal to follow. Jewish tradition affirms that with certain peace offerings of festivals (*Hagigah* and *Sheincah*) no bread was offered.

Ver. 14. **One out of each offering**—*i. e.*, one cake out of the number of each kind presented, and perhaps one from the loaves of leavened bread. **An heave offering.**—Herein this oblation is strongly distinguished from the oblations accompanying the burnt offering. No part of them was placed upon the altar. Comp. the heave offerings of the Levites, Num. xviii. 26-30. It must be inadvertently that Lange says "one of the unleavened cakes was offered to Jehovah on His altar as a heave offering; all the rest of the meat offering fell to the share of the priest who sacrificed;" for it is plain from the text that the one offered as a heave offering was not consumed, but belonged to the officiating priest, while the rest were returned to the offerer. The heave offering was waved in the

hands up and down before the altar, but not placed upon it.

Ver. 15. **Shall be eaten the same day.**—Comp. the similar provision in regard to the Paschal lamb, Ex. xii. 10, and also in regard to the manna, Ex. xvi. 19. The same command is repeated in regard to the thank offering in xxii. 29, 30; while the greater liberty allowed in the vow and voluntary offerings (ver. 16) is also repeated xix. 5-8. In both cases Jewish tradition affirms that the rule applied also to the accompanying oblations. The difference of time allowed in which the flesh of these two kinds of peace offerings might be eaten evidently marks the one as of a superior sacredness to the other. Yet it is not easy to say wherein precisely the difference consisted. The general observation is that the thank offerings were purely unselfish, offered in gratitude for blessings already received; while the vow and voluntary offerings had respect to something yet hoped for, and therefore involved a selfish element. But it is not altogether clear that this was the case with the voluntary offering. Outram (p. 131, Eng. tr.), on the authority of Maimonides and Abarbanel, makes the distinction to consist in the vow offering being *general*—a promise to present a certain kind of victim or its value, and this remained in all cases binding; while the voluntary offering was *particular*—a promise to present a particular animal, which became void in case of the animal's death. Under this interpretation both have respect to the future. If there were any accidental remainder of the thank offering after the first day, it was doubtless consumed (but not on the altar), as in the case of the Paschal lamb (Ex. xii. 10) and of the other peace offerings (ver. 17), and the consecration offerings (Ex. xxix. 34). Several reasons have been assigned for the limitation of the time for eating. Outram says, "The short space of time within which the victims might be eaten, seems to have been designed to prevent any corruption of the sacrifices, and to guard against covetousness," and he quotes Philo at length in support of this double reason. The incentive hereby added to the command to share these feasts with the poor, and especially the poor Levites, though entirely rejected by Keil, is made more or less prominent by Theodoret (who gives this reason only), Corn. à Lapide, Kalisch, Rosenmüller, and others. "The recollection that in warm lands meat soon spoils, may give us the idea that the feaster was compelled in consequence to invite in the poor." Lange. It must be remembered also that the feast would rapidly lose its sacrificial associations as the interval was prolonged between it and the offering of the sacrifice.

Vers. 16–18. The vow and voluntary offerings. The distinction between these has already been pointed out. Both were clearly inferior to the thank offering. It is to be remembered that these did not belong to the class of expiatory offerings, and hence the vow offering of St. Paul (Acts xviii. 18; xxi. 23–26) had in it nothing inconsistent with his faith in the one Sacrifice for sins offered on Calvary. These offerings might be eaten on the two days following the sacrifice, but the remainder **on the third day shall be burnt with fire.**

Ver. 18. The penalty for the transgression of this command was not only that the offering went for nothing—**it shall not be accepted**; but further, **it shall be an abomination, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity.** The sense is not, as many suppose, that the offering being made void, the offerer remained with his former iniquity uncleansed; for these offerings were not at all appointed for the purpose of atonement, or the forgiveness of sin; but that the offerer, having transgressed a plain and very positive command, must bear the consequences of such transgression.

The distinctions in regard to these offerings (as in the case of those which have gone before) embrace only the common sacrifices of their kind. There were other special peace-offerings (xxiii. 19, 20) which were otherwise dealt with.

In later times, the place where the peace-offerings might be eaten was restricted to the holy city (Deut. xii. 6, 7, 11, 12); at present, there was no occasion for such a command, while all were together in the camp in the wilderness. But all sacrificial animals slain for food must be offered as sacrifice to the Lord (xvii. 3, 4).

Kalisch (p. 144 ss.) says: "The character of these feasts cannot be mistaken. It was that of joyfulness tempered by solemnity, of solemnity tempered by joyfulness: the worshipper had submitted to God an offering from his property; he now received back from Him a part of the dedicated gift, and thus experienced anew the same gracious beneficence which had enabled him to appear with his wealth before the altar; he therefore consumed that portion with feelings of humility and thankfulness; but he was bidden at once to manifest those blissful sentiments by sharing the meat not only with his household, which thereby was reminded of the divine protection and mercy, but also with his needy fellow-beings, whether laymen or servants of the temple. Thus these beautiful repasts were stamped both with religious emotion and human virtue. The relation of friendship between God and the offerer which the sacrifice exhibited was expressed and sealed by the feast which intensified that relation into one of an actual *covenant;* the momentary harmony was extended to a permanent union; and these notions could not be expressed more intelligibly, at least to an Eastern people, than by a common meal, which to them is the familiar image of friendship and communion, of cheerfulness and joy. . . . . Some critics have expressed an opposite view, contending that the offerer was not considered as the guest of God, but, on the contrary, God as the guest of the offerer; but this is against the clear expressions of the law; the sacrificer surrendered the whole victim to the Deity (iii. 1, 6, 7, 12), and confirmed his intention by burning on the altar the fat parts, which represented the entire animal. . . . The Apostle Paul says distinctly: 'Are not they who eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar' or 'of the Lord's table?'"

Vers. 19-21. The sanctity of even this inferior sacrifice is strongly guarded. Peace-offerings being representative especially of communion with the Most Holy, all uncleanness or contact with uncleanness is rigorously forbidden.

Ver. 19. **And as for the flesh, all that be clean shall eat thereof,**—meaning, of course, the flesh in general—that which has *not* touched any unclean thing. The sense might easily be made more clear; but there is no ground for altering the translation.

Ver. 20. **Shall be cut off from his people,** *i. e.* be excommunicated, cast out from the commonwealth of Israel. This might sometimes, as in Ex. xxxi. 14, involve also the punishment of death, but only when the offence was also a civil one. Capital punishment is not intended by the expression itself.—**That pertain unto the Lord.**—This shows plainly enough that the victim, once offered, was considered as belonging to God, and hence that they who feasted upon it were the guests of the Lord.

Ver. 21. **Unclean beast,** *etc.* This is to be understood of the dead bodies of these animals. Uncleanness was not communicated by their touch while living; but, on the other hand, it was communicated by the touch of the body, even of clean animals which had died a natural death, or as we should say, of carrion.

Nothing is here said of the portion of the priests, that being the subject of a distinct divine communication (vers. 28-36).

G. Instructions in regard to the Fat and the Blood. Vers. 22-27. From its importance, this group of commands forms the exclusive subject of another communication, and is addressed to the *people*, because, while these portions were in the especial charge of the priests, it was necessary to warn the people very carefully against making use of them themselves. It comes appropriately in connection with the peace offerings, because it was only of these that the people eat at all, and hence here there was especial liability to transgress this command.

Ver. 22. **No manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat.**—The prohibition of the eating of fat extends only to the sacrificial animals, and is to be so understood in ch. iii. 17. The reason of this prohibition appears in ver. 25: this fat was appropriated to burning upon the altar, and hence any other use of it was a profanation. While the Israelites were in the wilderness, all animals slain for food, which were allowed in sacrifice, were presented as victims, and their fat was burned on the altar. Afterwards, in view of the settlement in the promised land, this restriction was removed, Deut. xii. 15, 21. With that permission the prohibition of blood is emphatically repeated; but nothing is said of the fat. Hence Keil argues that in such case the eating of the fat was allowable, and this opinion is strongly confirmed by Deut. xxxii. 14, enumerating among the good things to be enjoyed the "fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of Bashan." Nevertheless, the language of universal prohibition is distinct in ch. iii. 17, unless that is to be understood only of animals offered in sacrifice. The generality of commentators understand, in accordance with Jewish tradition, that the fat of the sacrificial animals was perpetually forbidden. In any case the prohibited fat was of course that which was burned on the altar, the *separable* fat, not that which was intermingled with the flesh.

Ver. 24. That which died of itself, its blood not having been poured out, and that which was torn of beasts, was prohibited as food (xxii. 8), and if any partook of it, he must undergo purification, and "be unclean until the even" (xvii. 15). The fat of such animals therefore could no more be eaten than their flesh; but since it was also unfit for the altar, it might **be used in any other use.** Nothing is said of the fat of fowls as no special use was made of this on the altar.

Vers. 26, 27. The prohibition of blood is absolute and perpetual, and this for the reasons given in xvii. 11. It has been urged that as nothing is anywhere said of the blood of fish, that is not included in the prohibition. More probably this was of too little importance to obtain particular mention, and the general principle on which blood is absolutely forbidden must be considered as applying here also, notwithstanding any tradition to the contrary.

H. Instructions for the priests' portion of the peace offerings. Vers. 28-36.

This, the final communication of this part of the book, is also addressed to the people, because the priests' portion was taken from that which would otherwise have been returned to them, and it therefore concerned them to understand the law. It stands here quite in its right place: "When the priest's rights in all the other sacrifices were enumerated, this was omitted, because the people here took the place of the priest in respect of the flesh. When the special nature of this offering in this respect has been made prominent, a new communication is made, addressed to the sons of Israel, and directing them, among other things, to assign certain portions of the victim to the priest." Murphy.

Ver. 29. **Shall bring his offering unto the Lord.**—The object of this provision seems to be to secure an actual, instead of a merely constructive offering. As most of the flesh was to be consumed by the offerer, it might possibly have been supposed sufficient merely to send in the consecrated parts; but the law regards the whole as offered to the Lord, and therefore requires that it shall be distinctly presented before Him.

Ver. 30. **His own hands shall bring.**—Still further to guard the sacrificial character of this offering, which was more in danger of being secularized than any other, it is required that the parts especially destined for the Lord's use might not be sent in by any servant or other messenger, but must be presented by the offerer's own hands. Comp. viii. 27; Ex. xxix. 24-26; Num. vi. 19, 20.—**The fat with the breast.**—The construction of לַחֲזֵה is as in Ex. xii. 8, 9. *Breast* is that part between the shoulders in front which we call *the brisket*, and which included the cartilaginous breast-bone.

A wave-offering.—The breast is to be a wave-offering, the right leg (ver. 31) a **heave-offering.** These two kinds of offering are clearly distinguished in the law. Both are mentioned together in ver. 34, and frequently (x. 14, 15; Ex. xxix. 24-27; Num. vi. 20; xviii. 11, 18, 19, *etc.*) as distinct offerings; the heave-

offering is mentioned alone (xxii. 12; Ex. xxv. 2, 3; xxx. 13-15; xxxv. 5; xxxvi. 3, 6; Num. xv. 19-21; xviii. 24; xxxi. 29, 41, 52, *etc.*), and so is the wave offering (xiv. 12, 21, 24; xxiii. 15, 17, 20; Ex. xxxviii. 24, 29; Num. viii. 11, 13, *etc.*); although both apparently are sometimes used simply in the sense of offering and coupled together without distinction of meaning (Ex. xxxv. 21-24); both are here applied to the offerings of metal for the tabernacle, though the other offerings are only spoken of as heave offerings. The distinction is much obscured in the A. V. by the frequent translation of both by the simple word *offering*, and sometimes without any note of this in the margin. In regard to the parts of the sacrifices designated by the two terms, the distinction is clearly marked; the heave-leg belonged exclusively to the officiating priest, while the wave-breast was the common property of the priestly order. The distinction in the ceremonial between them it is less easy to make. That of the wave offering appears to have been the more solemn and emphatic, consisting in the priest placing his hands under those of the offerer (which held the offering to be waved), and moving them to and fro—some of the Rabbins say, towards each of the four quarters, and also up and down. The heaving, on the other hand, appears to have been a simple lifting up of the offering. (See authorities in Outram I. 15, § V.) In all cases of the wave offering of parts of animals, only the fat was burned, except in the peculiar case of the consecration of the priests commanded in Ex. xxix. 22-26, and fulfilled in viii. 25-29, when the leg was also burned. In the case of the "waving" of the Levites (Num. viii. 11-19), they were wholly given up to God as the ministrants of the priests. Lange says: "The breast may represent the bold readiness, the leg the energetic progress, which in the priest are always desirable."

During the sojourn in the wilderness, where all sacrificial animals that were to be eaten were offered in sacrifice, the priests' portion was only the breast and the right leg; afterwards, when permission was given to kill these animals for food in the scattered habitations of the people, and thereby the perquisites of the priests were greatly reduced, there was added (Deut. xviii. 3) "the shoulder (זְרֹעַ) and the two cheeks and the maw."

Ver. 34. **A statute forever.**—As long as the sacrificial system and the Aaronic priesthood should endure.

Ver. 35. **In the day when he presented them.**—At the time when God, by the hand of Moses, brought them near to minister. The verb is without an expressed nominative in the Hebrew as in the English.

The conclusion of this part of the book. Vers. 37, 38.

Ver. 37. The enumeration in this verse is to be understood not merely of the immediately preceding section; but of the whole law of sacrifice as given in all the preceding chapters.

Of the consecrations.—Lit., "of the fillings" *sc.* of the hands. Comp. Ex. xxix. 19-28. The ordinance for the consecration of the priests has been given in full there; but still something of it has been directed here (vi. 19-23) so that it must necessarily appear in this recapitulation.

Ver. 38. **In Mount Sinai.**—That this expression is used broadly for the region of Mt. Sinai, not distinctively for the mountain itself, is apparent from the concluding clause of the verse.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. In the stress laid upon the necessity of maintaining perpetually the fire divinely kindled on the altar, is taught the necessity of the divine approval of the means by which man seeks to approach God. The only Mediator under the old Covenant as under the new, is Christ; but as the divine appointment was of old necessary to constitute the types which prefigured Him, and by means of which the worshipper availed himself of His sacrifice,—so now, man may claim the benefits of Christ's work for his redemption only in those ways which God has approved.

II. The priests, and the high-priest, like the people, must offer oblations and sacrifices. They were separated from the people only in so far as the functions of their office required; in the individual relation of their souls to God, they formed no caste, and stood before Him on no different footing from others. This is a fundamental principle in all the divine dealings with man; "there is no respect of persons with God," (Rom. ii. 11, *etc.*).

III. In the assimilation of the trespass to the sin offering is shown how wrong done to man is also sin against God; while in the peculiar ordinances belonging to the sin offering alone, we see the peculiar sinfulness of that sin which is committed directly against God.

IV. The provision for a portion for the priests from the various offerings, and from the oblation accompanying the whole burnt offering sets forth in act the general principle declared in words in the New Testament, "that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple." (1 Cor. ix. 13).

V. The peace offerings are called in the LXX. frequently "sacrifices of praise" (*θυσίαι τῆς αἰνεσέως*); by the use of the same phraseology in the Ep. to the Heb. (xiii. 15) applied to Christ, He is pointed out as the Antitype of this sacrifice: "By Him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise (*θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*) to God continually;" and again (ver. 10) "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."

VI. In the oblation accompanying the peace offering leavened bread was required. This could not be admitted for burning upon the altar for reasons already given; nevertheless it must be presented to the Lord for a heave offering. Many things in man's daily life cannot, from their nature, be directly appropriated to the service of God; yet all must be sanctified by being presented before Him.

VII. In the strict prohibition to the people of the fat which was appropriated as the Lord's portion was taught, in a way suited to the apprehension of the Israelites, the general principle that whatever has been appropriated to God may not rightly be diverted to any other use.

VIII. The various kinds of sacrifice here recognized as means of approach to God, and the provisions for their constant repetition, alike indicate their intrinsic insufficiency and temporary character. Otherwise "would they not have ceased to be offered, because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins?" (Heb. x. 2).

IX. The same temporary and insufficient character attached to the peace offerings, which expressed communion with God. As Keil has pointed out, they still left the people in the outer court, while God was enthroned behind the vail in the holy of holies, and this vail could only be removed by the sacrifice on Calvary. And in general, as the office of the old Covenant was to give the knowledge of sin rather than, by anything within itself, completely to do it away; so was it designed to awaken rather than to satisfy the desire for reconciliation and communion with God. In so far as it actually accomplished either purpose, it was by its helping the faith of the worshippers to lean, through its types, upon the one true Sacrifice in the future.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

VI. Vers. 9-13. The ever-burning fire; kindled by God, but kept alive by man; the acceptance of our efforts to approach God is from Him, but He gives or withholds it according to our desire and exertion. "Quench not the Spirit." (1 Thess. v. 19). The Spirit *ζωοποιεῖ*, but it is for us *ἀναζωπυρεῖν* (2 Tim. i. 6) Wordsworth. **Put on his linen garment**; the inward purity required in those who are serving immediately at the altar is fitly symbolized by outward signs. Even that which is becoming in service of other kinds, as the carrying forth of the ashes, may well be replaced in duties which are more nearly related to the divine Presence.

Vers. 14-18. The oblation. That is truly offered to God which is consumed in His service, though but the "memorial" of it and the frankincense, typifying prayer and praise, can be actually given directly to Him. **Whatsoever toucheth them shall be holy.**—As there is a contaminating effect in contact with evil, so is there a sanctifying effect from close contact with that which is holy. The woman in the Gospel by faith touched the holy One, and virtue went forth to heal her from her uncleanness. Origen (Hom. 4 in Lev.).

Vers. 19-23. The high-priest must offer an oblation for himself as well as for the people. Man never reaches on earth a stage of holiness so high that he needs not means of approach to God; He alone who "was without sin" offered Himself for us.

Vers. 24-30. Everything connected with the sin-offering is to be scrupulously guarded from defilement, and everything which it touches receives from it somewhat of its own character; a fit emblem and type of the true Sacrifice for sins, Himself without sin. Whoever seeks the benefit of this Sacrifice, must "die unto sin," and whoever is sprinkled by His all-availing blood becomes thereby "purged from sin." Yet even so, the virtue of that blood may not be carried out of the sanctuary of God's presence; they who, having been touched by the blood shed on Calvary, would depart from communion with God, must leave behind them all the efficacy of that atonement.

VII. Vers. 1-6. Though the sin whose prominent feature is harm done, be less than that in which the offence is more directly against God, yet for the forgiveness of one there is essentially the same law as for the other. Both are violations of the law of love, and love toward God and man are so bound together that neither can truly exist without the other (1 Jno. iv. 20), and there can be no breach of the one without the other.

Vers. 11-21. The peace offering was at once communion of the offerer with God and also the opportunity for extending his bounty to his fellow-men. So always there is the same connection. It was said to Cornelius, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial." "To do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16). The thank offering has a higher place than the vow or the voluntary offering: that is a nearer communion with God in which the grateful heart simply pours out its thanksgivings, than that in which, with some touch of selfishness, it still seeks some further blessing. Yet both are holy. But uncleanness allowed to continue, debarred from such communion; and sin, unrepented, in its very nature now forbids it.

Vers. 37, 38. A summary of the law of sacrifice in its variety. All these sacrifices were (as elsewhere shown) types of Christ; for it was impossible that the fulness of His gracious offices could be set forth by any single type. He is at once the whole burnt offering of complete consecration of Himself, through whom also we "present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God;" and He is, too, the oblation, as that which man must present to God with his other sacrifices, as it is in and through Christ alone that our sacrifices can be acceptable; He is the sin offering, as it is through Him alone that our sins can be "covered" and effectual atonement be made for us; as trespass offering also, it is through His love shed abroad from Calvary, that we learn that love towards our fellow-men in the exercise of which only can our transgressions against Him be forgiven; and so too is He the peace offering, for His very name is "Peace." His coming was "peace on earth," and by Him have we peace and communion with God. No one of these alone can fully typify Christ; beforehand each of His great offices in our behalf must be set forth by a separate symbolical teaching; but when He has come, all these separate threads are gathered into one, and He is become our "all in all."

PART SECOND. HISTORICAL.

CHAPTERS VIII.—X.

"The Sacrificing Priesthood: Its Consecration and its Typical Discipline shown by the Death of Nadab and Abihu."—LANGE.

The law of sacrifices having now been given, and the duties of the priests in regard to them appointed, all necessary preparation has been made for carrying out the consecration of the priests as commanded in Ex. xxix. This historical section follows, therefore, in its natural order, and takes up the thread of events at the close of the book of Exodus, where it was broken off that the necessary laws might be announced. There is, first, the consecration of the priests (chap. viii.), occupying seven days; then the record of the actual entrance of Aaron and his sons upon the discharge of their functions (chap. ix.); closing with the account of the transgression of two of those sons in their first official act, and their consequent punishment, together with certain instructions for the priests occasioned by this event (chap. x.). To enter understandingly upon the consideration of these chapters, it is necessary to have in mind the origin, nature, and functions of the priesthood. These will be briefly discussed in the following

PRELIMINARY NOTE ON THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD.

In the early days of the human race such priestly functions as were exercised at all were naturally undertaken by the head of the family, and hence arose what is called the patriarchal priesthood, of which the Scripture patriarchs are standing illustrations. When, however, families were multiplied and formed into communities or nations, the former provision was manifestly insufficient, and we meet with instances of priests for a larger number, as Jethro, "the priest of Midian" (for *priest* seems here to be the proper rendering of כֹּהֵן). The chief priestly office was sometimes, and perhaps generally, associated with the chief civil authority, as in the case of "Melchisedec, king of Salem . . . . . the priest of the Most High God" (Gen. xiv. 18), and among the heathen, Balak, who offered his sacrifices himself (Num. xxiii.); a trace of this custom may perhaps be preserved in the occasional use of כֹּהֵן for prince (Job xii. 19; 2 Sam. viii. 18; xx. 26?). But in large nations the actual functions of the priestly office must necessarily have devolved chiefly upon inferior priests. In Egypt the Israelites had been accustomed to a numerous, wealthy, and powerful body of priests, at the head of which stood the monarch. It is unnecessary to speak of these further than to note a few points in which they were strongly contrasted with the priests of Israel. In the first place, although the monarch was at the head of the whole priestly caste, yet as the popular religion of Egypt was polytheistic, each principal Divinity had his especial body of priests with a high-priest at their head. In contrast with this, monotheism was distinctly set forth in the Levitical legislation, by the one body of priests, with its single high-priest at its head. The Egyptian priests maintained an esoteric theology, not communicated to the people, in which it would appear that the unity of the Self-existent God and many other important truths were taught; in Israel the priests were indeed the keepers and guardians of the law (Deut. xxxi. 9, *etc.*), but they were diligently to teach it all to the people (Lev. x. 11), to read the whole of it every seventh year to all the assembled people (Deut. xxxi. 10–13), to supply the king with a copy for himself to write out in full (Deut. xvii. 18, 19), and in general to teach God's judgments to Jacob and His law to Israel (Deut. xxxiii. 10). While, therefore, from the nature of their occupation, they might be expected to have a more perfect knowledge of the law than the generality of the people, this knowledge was only more perfect as the result of more continued study, and might be equalled by any one who chose, and was actually shared by every one as far as he chose. The Egyptian priests were, moreover, great landed proprietors (besides being fed from the royal revenues, Gen. xlvii. 22), and actually possessed one-third of the whole territory of Egypt; the priests of Israel, on the contrary, were expressly excluded from the common inheritance of the tribes, and had assigned to them only the cities with their immediate suburbs actually required for their residence. The priesthood of Egypt culminated in the absolute monarch who was at their head, and in whose authority they in some degree shared; in Israel, on the other hand, the line between the civil and the priestly authority and functions was most sharply drawn, primarily in the case of Moses and Aaron, Joshua and Eleazar, generally in the time of the judges (although in that troubled period this, like all other parts of the Mosaic system, was sometimes confused), and finally under the monarchy. It is indeed sometimes asserted that the kings, by virtue of their prerogative, were entitled to exercise priestly functions; but for this there is no real ground. The instances relied on are either

manifest cases of sacrifice offered at the command of the monarch (1 Kings iii. 15; viii. 62–64); or of the simple wearing of an ephod (2 Sam. vi. 14), which by no means carried with it the priestly office; or else are misinterpretations of a particular word (1 Kings iv. 2, 5—see the Textual notes there; 2 Sam. viii. 18—the only case of real difficulty—comp. 1 Chr. xviii. 17). There are but two definite instances of the assumption of priestly functions by kings, and both of them were most sternly punished (1 Sam. xiii. 10–14; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16–21). There was also the intrusion of Korah and his companions on the priestly office and their exemplary punishment (Num. xvi.). In the later abnormal state under the Maccabees, it was not the kings who assumed priestly functions, but the priests who absorbed the royal prerogative. With these contrasts, it is plain that there was little in common between the Egyptian and Levitical priesthood, except what is necessarily implied in the idea of a priesthood at all, and is found in that of the nations of antiquity generally. They were, however, both hereditary (as was also the Brahminical priesthood); both were under a law of the strictest personal cleanliness, and there was a resemblance between them in several matters of detail, as linen dress, and other non-essential matters.

When the Israelites came out of Egypt, they were a people chosen—on condition of faithfulness and obedience—to be "a kingdom of priests and an holy nation" (Ex. xix. 6), and in accordance with this the paschal lamb was sacrificed by each head of a household, and eaten by himself and his family (Ex. xii. 6), and the same idea was retained in this sacrifice always. Nevertheless, the people were unprepared for so high a vocation, and soon after we find the existence of certain persons among the people recognized as priests "which come near to the Lord" (Ex. xix. 22, 24), although they did not receive the Divine sanction necessary to the continuance of their office. We have no knowledge of the nature of their functions, nor of their appointment. However this may have been, the people certainly shrank from that nearness of approach to God implied in the office of priest (Ex. xx. 19, 21; Deut. v. 23–27), and sacrifices were offered by "young men" appointed by Moses, he reserving to himself the strictly priestly function of sprinkling the blood (Ex. xxiv. 5–8). Such was the state of things at the time of the appointment of the Aaronic order; there was no divinely authorized priesthood, and the need of one was felt.

Meantime, in the solitude of Sinai, God directed Moses to take Aaron and his sons for an hereditary priesthood (Ex. xxviii. 1), and gave minute directions for their official dress, for their consecration and their duties (Ex. xxviii., xxix.). Emphasis is everywhere placed upon the fact that they were appointed of God (comp. Heb. v. 4). They were in no sense appointed by the people; had they been so, they could not have been mediators. It has been seen that the Levitical system makes prominent the fact that the sacrifices had no efficacy in themselves, but derived their whole value from the Divine appointment; so also in regard to the priesthood. The priests appear as themselves needing atonement, and obliged to offer for their own sins; yet by the commanded unction and dress they are constituted acceptable intercessors and mediators for the people. All was from God; and while this gave assurance to the people in their daily worship, at the same time the priests' own imperfection showed that the true reconciliation with God by the restoration of holiness to man had not yet been manifested. The Levitical priest could be but a type of that Seed of the woman who should bruise the serpent's head.

Before the directions concerning the priesthood, given to Moses alone in the Mount, could be announced, occurred the terrible apostasy of the golden calf, when, at the summons of Moses, "who is on the Lord's side?" the whole tribe of Levi consecrated themselves by their zeal on God's behalf (Ex. xxxii. 25–29). Subsequently (Num. iii. 5–10, 40–51), the Levites were taken as a substitute for all the first-born Israelites (who, under the patriarchal system, would have been their priests, and who had been spared in the slaughter of the Egyptian first-born) to minister to the chosen priestly family. Of these nothing is said in this book, except the modification in their favor of the law concerning the sale of houses in xxv. 32–34) (see Com.). They may therefore be here wholly passed by with the simple mention that they never had sacerdotal functions, and were not therefore a part of the sacerdotal class. It is, perhaps, for the purpose of making this distinction emphatically that no mention is made of them in this book where it might otherwise have been expected. As, however, they constituted the tribe from which the priests were taken, the latter are often called by their name, and thus we frequently meet with the expression in the later books, "the priests, the Levites," or even with "Levites" alone, meaning Levites, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, or priests.

But while there was an evident necessity that a much smaller body than the whole tribe of Levi should be taken for priests; and while Aaron, the elder brother, and appointed as the "prophet" of Moses (Ex. iv. 14–17), and associated with him in the whole deliverance of the people from Egypt, was evidently a most suitable person for the office, the law that the office should be hereditary must rest on other grounds. If we seek for these in any thing beyond the simple Divine good-pleasure, we should readily find them in the general fact of the whole Mosaic system being founded upon the principle of heirship leading on to the fulfilment of the Messianic promise; and in the more special one that it was by this means the priesthood was in the main kept true to God during long periods of Israel's apostasy and sin.

It is to be carefully observed that this hereditary office did not make of the priests *a caste;* in all things not immediately connected with the discharge of their functions, they were fellow-citizens with the other Israelites, subject to the same laws, bound by the same duties, and amenable to the same penalties. When not engaged in official duty, they wore the same dress, and might follow the same vocations as their fellow-citizens. They were only exempt from the payment of tithes because themselves supported by

them. In all this is manifest a striking contrast, not only with heathen priesthoods of antiquity, but also with the hierarchy of the Mediæval Christian Church.

The especial function of the priesthood was *to come near to God* (vii. 35; x. 3; xxi. 17; Num. xvi. 5, *etc.*). They were to stand in the vast gap between a sinful people and a holy God, themselves of the former, yet especially sanctified to approach the latter. "Hence their chief characteristic must be *holiness*, since they were elected to be perpetually near the Holy One and to serve Him (Num. xvi. 5); they were singled out from the rest of their brethren 'to be sanctified as most holy.' *To hallow* and *to install as priests* are used as correlative terms (Ex. xxix. 33; comp. vers. 1, 44; xxviii. 41; xl. 13). By neglecting what contributes to their sanctity they profane the holiness of God (Lev. xxi. 6–8); and the high-priest is himself the 'Holy One of the Lord' (Ps. cvi. 16)." Kalisch. They sustained a distinct mediatorial character between God and His people. This appears in every part of the law concerning them. The golden plate inscribed "holiness to the Lord," which the high-priest wore upon his brow, expressly meant that he should "bear the iniquity of the holy things which the children of Israel shall hallow" (Ex. xxviii. 38); and the flesh of the sin offerings was given to the priests "to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord" (Lev. x. 17). Of course this could be done by human priests only symbolically, as they were types of the great High Priest to come; and His all-sufficient sacrifice having once been offered, there could be thereafter no other priesthood in this relation to the people, or discharging this mediatorial function. The Christian ministry finds its analogy, not in the priests, but in the prophets of the old dispensation, although even here the likeness is very imperfect. Still, while the priests were required to preserve and teach the written law, it was left to the prophets to unfold its spiritual meaning, and to urge regard to it by argument and exhortation. It is a striking fact that the Greek word for priest, ἱερεύς, and its derivatives in the New Testament, while frequently applied to the priests of the old covenant and to Christ Himself, their Antitype, are never used for any office in the Christian Church, except for the general priesthood of the whole body of believers; προφήτης=*prophet*, however, and its cognates are thus used with great frequency. It is to be borne in mind that priest, in the Levitical sense of the word, and sacrifice are correlative terms; sacrifice pre-supposes a priest to offer it, and a priest must needs have "somewhat also to offer" (Heb. viii. 3). From these points flow all the duties of the priests, and in view of these their qualifications, and the other laws concerning them are fixed.

The first and chiefest of all their duties was the offering of sacrifice, as this was the especial instrumentality by which men sought to draw near to God. No sacrifice could be offered without the intervention of the appointed priest; for the sacrifices having no virtue in themselves, and deriving their value from the Divine appointment, must necessarily be presented in the way and by the persons whom God had authorized. Hence it is that in the ritual of the sacrifices an emphasis is always placed upon the declaration that the priests "shall make atonement." The apparent exceptions to this, in the case of Samuel and Elijah, are really but illustrations of the principle, they being prophets directly charged from on high to do this very thing. In this, including the burning of incense, the priests were undoubtedly typical of the one true High Priest and Mediator. They stood, as far as was possible for man, between God and the people, and by their acts were the people made—at least symbolically—holy, and brought near to God. The acts of sacrifice which were essential, and which therefore could only be performed by the priests, were the sprinkling or other treatment of the blood, and the burning of such parts as were to be consumed upon the altar. In the sin and trespass offerings, as well as in the oblations, which must be wholly consecrated to God, they were to consume the parts which were not burned.

From this essential duty naturally were derived a variety of others. To the priests belonged the care of the sanctuary and its sacred utensils, the preservation of the fire on the brazen altar, the burning of incense on the golden altar, the dressing and lighting of the lamps of the golden candlestick, the charge of the shew-bread, and other like duties. They were necessarily concerned in all those multitudinous acts of the Israelites which were connected with sacrifices, such as the accomplishment of the Nazarite vow, the ordeal of jealousy, the expiation of an unknown murder, the determination of the unclean and of the cleansed leprous persons, garments and houses; the regulation of the calendar; the valuation of devoted property which was to be redeemed; these and a multitude of other duties followed naturally from their priestly office. They were also to blow the silver trumpets on the various occasions of their use, and in connection with this to exhort the soldiers about to engage in battle to boldness, because they went to fight under the Lord. They were also, from their own familiarity with the law, appropriately appointed as the religious teachers of the people. From their priestly office they were charged to bless the people in the name of God; and from their privilege of consulting God especially through the Urim and Thummim, they were made arbiters in disputes of importance: "by their word shall every controversy and every violence be tried" (Deut. xxi. 5). All these secondary duties flowed from their primary one in connection with the sacrifices. Hence the influence and importance of the priests in the Hebrew commonwealth varied greatly with the religious earnestness and activity of the nation. Negatively, it is important to note that the priests did not, in any considerable degree, discharge towards the people the office of the Christian *pastor*, the spiritual guide, comforter and assistant of his flock. It is possible that if the people and the priests themselves had been prepared for it, something more of this relation might have resulted from the provisions of the law.

Still, they were not individually the priests of particular communities; but rather, as a body, the priests of the whole nation. From this it resulted that their connection with the people was little more than simply official and ministerial. In so far as the need of the *pastor* was met at all under the old dispensation, as already said, it was by the prophet rather than by the priests.

The same thing is also true of their revenue. This was chiefly derived from the "second tithe," or the tenth paid to them by the Levites from the tithes received by them from the people. Tithes were stringently commanded; but no power was lodged with any one for their compulsory collection. Their payment was left absolutely to the conscientious obedience of the people. The priests' support was supplemented by their share of the sacrifices, first-fruits, and other offerings of the people. Very ample provision appears to be made for them in the law; the Levites, who were much less than a tenth of the people, were to receive the tenth of all their increase; and the priests, who appear to have numbered still much less than the tenth of the Levites, were to receive the tenth of the income paid to them. Practically, during the far greater part of the Hebrew history, their support appears to have been precarious and insufficient, and we know that large numbers of them declined to return from the captivity of Babylon, and many of the descendants of those who did return did not exercise their priestly office or claim their priestly privileges.

The qualifications for the priesthood were first, Aaronic descent; to secure this genealogical registers were kept with great care (2 Chron. xxxi. 16, 17, *etc.*), and any one who could not find his descent upon them was not allowed to minister in the priest's office or to receive its emoluments (Ezra ii. 62; Neh. vii. 64). Secondly, they must be perfect physically, free from any bodily defect or injury; otherwise, they might eat of the priests' portion, and receive his tithe, but they were forbidden to approach the altar, or enter the sanctuary (Lev. xxi. 17-23). Further, during the time of their ministrations, they must be entirely free from any form of legal uncleanness (xxii. 1-7), and must practice frequent ablutions, especially on entering the sacred precincts (viii. 6; Ex. xl. 30-32), and they must carefully abstain from wine and strong drink (ch. x. 8-10); at all times they must maintain an especial symbolic purity, and particularly must never be defiled by the contact of a dead body, except in the case of the very nearest relatives (xxi. 2-4), even this exception being denied to the high-priest (*ib.* 10-12). No limit of age either for the beginning or the end of their service is fixed in the law; but in the absence of such limitation, the age appointed for the Levites would probably have been generally regarded as fitting. In later times there was great laxity in this respect, and Aristobulus was appointed high-priest by Herod the Great when only seventeen. In addition to these outward qualifications, exemplary holiness of life is everywhere required of the priests, and even in their families, violations of virtue were visited with more severity than among others (xxi. 9).

In marriage the priests generally were only restricted in their choice to virgins or widows of any of the tribes of their nation (xxi. 7); later, marriage within the Aaronic family seems to have been preferred, and by the prophet Ezekiel (xliv. 22) the marriage with widows (except of priests) was forbidden them.

They were originally inducted into their office by a solemn consecration, and were sprinkled with the sacrificial blood and the holy anointing oil (ch. ix.); but, except for the high-priest, this one consecration sufficed for all their descendants, and was not repeated.

While on duty in the sanctuary they were arrayed in robes of linen which might never pass beyond the sacred precincts; and they must minister at the altar unshod.

In the small number of priests at first, it was probably necessary that all of them should be constantly on duty; but when in later times they had greatly multiplied, they were divided by David into twenty-four courses, each with a chief at its head, who should minister in turn (1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 4). This arrangement was maintained ever after, although on the return from the captivity, some of the courses were wanting from the returning exiles (Neh. xii. 1–7; 12–21).

The whole order of the priests was concentrated, so to speak, in the high-priest. His office was also hereditary, but not with the same strictness. We find in the time of Eli that the high priesthood had passed to the house of Ithamar (Aaron's younger son), and from his descendants it was again by divine direction transferred back to the elder branch. The duties and responsibilities of the high-priest were far more solemn than that of the ordinary priests. "Pity and sympathy also, according to the Ep. to the Hebr., enter into the idea of the high-priest." Lange. There could be only one high-priest at a time, although a second, in some degree at least, seems to have been permitted during that abnormal period during the reign of David when the ark and the tabernacle were separated. The high-priest was restricted in marriage to a Hebrew virgin; his official robes were of the utmost splendor, and on his breast he wore the precious stones on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes of Israel, while on the golden plate on his forehead was inscribed "holiness unto the LORD;" he was originally consecrated by a more ample anointing than his brethren, and this was repeated for each of his successors, so that he is described as having "the crown of the anointing oil of his God upon him" (xxi. 12), and, as we have seen, is often designated simply as "the anointed priest;" he must have succeeded to his office at whatever age his predecessor died or became incapacitated, and continued in it to the end of his own life, which formed a civil epoch (Num. xxxv. 28, 32); no especial provision is made in the law for his support, and history shows that it was unnecessary to do so, as he was always amply provided for; the high-priest was forbidden the contact with the dead and the customary marks of sorrow even in those few cases which were permitted to other priests (xxi. 10-12), and that on the express ground of the peculiar com-

pleteness of his consecration. But his chief distinction lay in his being the embodiment, as it were, of the whole theocracy, and the mediator between God and the whole people. This was signified by manifold symbols on his robes; it was shown by his duty of offering the sin offering for himself and for the whole people (the same victim being required for each); and especially by his most solemn duties on the great day of Atonement (ch. xvi.). From his position and religious duties necessarily flowed many others, as in the case of the ordinary priests, only that in the one case as in the other those of the high-priest were far higher and more important. In the Epistle to the Hebrews he is singled out not only as the representative of the whole priestly system, but as peculiarly the type of Christ, the one great High-Priest, Who alone could make effectual atonement, once for all, for the sins of all people. A "second priest," or vice high-priest, is mentioned Jer. lii. 24, and such an office is recognized by the later Jews. Literature: KALISCH, *Preliminary Essay on Lev. VIII.*, and many of the works already mentioned under Sacrifices. KUEPER, *Das Priesterthum des Alten Bundes*, Berlin, 1865.

FIRST SECTION.

The Consecration of the Priests.

CHAP. VIII. 1–36.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Take Aaron and his sons with him,
and the garments, and the anointing oil, and a [the[1]] bullock for the sin-offering,
3 and [the[1]] two rams, and a [the[1]] basket of unleavened bread: and gather thou all
the congregation together unto the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congre-
4 gation. And Moses did as the LORD commanded him; and the assembly [con-
gregation[2]] was gathered together unto the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the]
5 congregation. And Moses said unto the congregation, This *is* the thing which the
LORD commanded to be done.
6 And Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed [bathed[3]] them with water.
7 And he put upon him the coat, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him
with the robe, and put the ephod upon him, and he girded him with the curious
8 [*curious*[4]] girdle of the ephod, and bound *it* unto him therewith. And he put the
breastplate upon him: also he put in the breastplate the Urim and the Thummim.
9 And he put the mitre upon his head; also upon the mitre, *even* upon his forefront,
did he put [and upon the mitre upon his forehead did he put[5]] the golden plate,
10 the holy crown; as the LORD commanded Moses. And Moses took the anointing
oil, and anointed the tabernacle [dwelling-place[6]] and all that *was* therein, and
11 sanctified them.[7] And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and an-
ointed the altar and all his vessels, both the laver and his foot, to sanctify them.
12 And he poured of[8] the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanc-
13 tify him. And Moses brought Aaron's sons, and put coats upon them, and girded

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. The Heb. has the article in all these cases, and it should be retained as referring to the commands given in Ex. xxix.

[2] Ver. 4. הָעֵדָה. The word being precisely the same as in ver. 3, should certainly have the same translation. The Vulg. and Syr. prefix *all*, as in ver. 3.

[3] Ver. 6. וַיִּרְחַץ. See Textual Note [29] on xiv. 8.

[4] Ver. 7. חֵשֶׁב means simply girdle, and there is nothing in the Heb. answering to *curious*, yet as this word is used only of the girdle of the Ephod, while there are several other words for the ordinary girdle, and as the A. V. has uniformly rendered it *curious girdle*, it may be well to retain the adjective as the readiest way of marking in English the peculiarity of the girdle. It should, however, be in italics.

[5] Ver. 9. The A. V. is unnecessarily complicated. For the second וַיָּשֶׂם the Sam. reads וַיִּתֵּן.

[6] Ver. 10. מִשְׁכָּן. See Textual Note [8] on xv. 31.

[7] Ver. 10. Three MSS., followed by the LXX., read *it* in the singular.

[8] Ver. 12. One MS., followed by the Vulg., omits the partitive מִן.

them with girdles [a girdle[9]], and put [bound] bonnets upon them; as the LORD commanded Moses.

14 And he brought the bullock for the sin offering: and Aaron and his sons laid[10]
15 their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin offering. And he slew *it;* and Moses took the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar, and poured the blood at the bottom of the altar,
16 and sanctified it, to make reconciliation upon it [to atone for it[11]]. And he took all the fat that *was* upon the inwards, and the caul *above* the liver, and the two
17 kidneys, and their fat, and Moses burnt *it*[12] upon the altar. But the bullock, and his hide, his flesh, and his dung, he burnt with fire without the camp; as the LORD
18 commanded Moses. And he brought[13] the ram for the burnt offering: and Aaron
19 and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram. And he killed *it;* and
20 Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about. And he cut the ram into
21 pieces; and Moses burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat. And he washed the inwards and the legs in water; and Moses burnt the whole ram upon the altar: it[14] *was* a burnt sacrifice for a sweet savour, *and* [*omit and*] an offering made by fire
22 unto the LORD; as the LORD commanded Moses. And he brought the other ram, the ram of consecration: and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head
23 of the ram. And he slew *it;* and Moses took of the blood of it, and put *it* upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the
24 great toe of his right foot. And he[15] brought Aaron's sons, and Moses put of the blood upon the tip of their right ear, and upon the thumbs [thumb[16]] of their right hands, and upon the great toes [toe[16]] of their right feet: and Moses sprinkled the
25 blood upon the altar round about. And he took the fat, and the rump [the fat tail[17]] and all the fat that *was* upon the inwards, and the caul *above* the liver, and
26 the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right shoulder [leg[18]]: and out of the basket of unleavened bread,[19] that *was* before the LORD, he took one unleavened cake, and a cake of oiled bread, and one wafer, and put *them* on the fat, and upon the right
27 shoulder [leg[19]]: and he put all upon Aaron's hands, and upon his sons' hands,
28 and waved them *for* a wave offering before the LORD. And Moses took them from off their hands, and burnt *them*[20] on the altar upon the burnt offering: they *were* consecrations for a sweet savour: it[21] *is* an offering made by fire unto the LORD.
29 And Moses took the breast, and waved it *for* a wave offering before the LORD: *for* of the ram of consecration it was Moses' part; as the LORD commanded Moses.
30 And Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which *was* upon the altar, and sprinkled *it* upon Aaron, *and* upon his garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments with him; and sanctified Aaron, *and* his garments, and his sons, and his sons' garments with him.

31 And Moses said unto Aaron and to his sons, Boil the flesh *at* the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation[22]: and there eat with the bread that *is* in the basket of consecrations, as I [am[23]] commanded, saying, Aaron and his sons
32 shall eat it. And that which remaineth of the flesh and of the bread shall ye burn

[9] Ver. 13. אַבְנֵט in the sing. (The ancient versions, however, have the plural). An entirely different word from חֵשֶׁב of ver. 7.

[10] Ver. 14. The Heb. verb וַיִּסְמֹךְ is in the sing. In the corresponding clause in ver. 18 it is plural, and so it is made here also by the Sam. and Syr.

[11] Ver. 15. לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו. It is better here, as in vi. 30 (23), and xvi. 20, to retain the almost universal rendering of כִּפֶּר in the A. V. These three places are the only exceptions in Ex., Lev., or Num. The sense is clearly *for it*, rather than *upon it*, and it is so rendered in the corresponding passage. Ex. xxix. 36, comp. 37.

[12] Ver. 16. The missing pronoun is supplied in one MS. and the Arab.

[13] Ver. 18. For וַיִּקְרֵב the Sam. reads וַיִּגַּשׁ.

[14] Ver. 21. Five MSS., the Syr. and Vulg., omit the pronoun.

[15] Ver. 24. The LXX. says, Moses brought.

[16] Ver. 24. The singular, which is the Heb. form, is quite as accurate and expressive.

[17] Ver. 25. See Text. Note [7] on iii. 9.

[18] Ver. 25. See Text. Note [30] on vii. 32.

[19] Ver. 26. The LXX. here reads ἀπὸ τοῦ κανοῦ τῆς τελειώσεως.

[20] Ver. 28. The pronoun is supplied by one MS., the LXX., and the Syr.

[21] Ver. 28. This pronoun is wanting in two MSS., the Vulg. and Arab.

[22] Ver. 31. The Sam. and LXX. add ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ.

[23] Ver. 31. The A. V. follows the Masoretic punctuation צִוִּיתִי; but the LXX., Vulg. and Syr., that of ver. 35 צִוִּיתִי.

33 with fire. And ye shall not go out of the door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the]
congregation *in* seven days, until the days of your consecration be at an end: for
34 seven days shall he consecrate you. As he hath done this day, *so* the LORD hath
35 commanded to do, to make an atonement for you. Therefore shall ye abide *at* the
door of the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation day and night seven days,
36 and keep the charge of the LORD, that ye die not: for so I am commanded. So
Aaron and his sons did all things which the LORD commanded by the hand of
Moses.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

In the chapters of this section we have the only prolonged narrative in Leviticus, in fact the only historical matter at all except the punishment of the blasphemer in xxiv. 10-23.

Ver. 1. **The LORD spake.**—A special command to carry out now the command already given minutely in Ex. xxviii., xxix., and xl.

Vers. 2-5 contain the preliminary arrangements. Moses takes Aaron and his sons, and the various things previously provided for their consecration, and brings them into the court of the tabernacle. The four sons of Aaron were brought, and the language would also include his grandsons, if there were any at this time of suitable age. The fact, however, that Eleazar entered the promised land, would make him less than twenty-one at this time, and therefore too young to have sons of sufficient age, and no sons of Nadab and Abihu are ever anywhere mentioned. The people were also gathered about the wide opening of the court, probably represented by their elders in the nearest places, and the mass of the men generally standing upon the surrounding heights which overlooked the tabernacle. Lange: "This is the ordinance: first, the persons; then the garments as symbols of the office; the anointing oil, the symbol of the Spirit; the bullock for the sin offering, the symbol of the priest favored with the entrusted atonement, and yet needing favor; the ram for the burnt offering, the symbol of the sacrificial employment; the ram for the sacrifice of consecration, the symbol of the priestly emoluments in true sacrifices of consecration; and the basket of unleavened bread, the symbol of life's enjoyments of the priests, sanctified in every form by the oil of the Spirit."

Ver. 2. The basket, according to Ex. xxix. 2, 3, 23, contained three kinds of bread all unleavened, the loaf, the oil bread, and the wafer anointed with oil.

Vers. 3, 4. The consecration was thus public, not only that Aaron might not seem "to take this honor unto himself;" but also that by their presence, the people might be assenting to the consecration of him who was to minister among them and for them.

Vers. 6–13. The washing, anointing, and investiture.

Ver. 6. **And bathed them with water.**—Not merely their hands and their feet, which Moses must have already done for himself, and which was always done by every priest who entered the tabernacle, or who approached the altar (Ex. xl. 31, 32); but doubtless an ablution of the whole body as seems to be intended in Ex. xxix. 4, and as was practised on the great day of atonement (ch. xvi. 4). This washing was obviously symbolical of the purity required in those who draw near to God, and is applied spiritually to the whole body of Christians, "made priests unto God" in Heb. x. 22. With this comp. Christ's receiving of baptism (Matt. iii. 13-15) before entering upon His public ministry.

Vers. 7–9. The robing of Aaron comes first, then the sanctification of the tabernacle and all it contained, especially of the altar, then the anointing of Aaron, and finally the robing of his sons. Neither here nor in Ex. xxix. 5 is there any mention of the "linen breeches" of Ex. xxviii. 42; xxxix. 28 probably because these were simply "to cover their nakedness," and were not considered a part of the official costume. As Kalisch suggests, Aaron and his sons probably put them on themselves immediately after their ablution. On the remaining articles of apparel see Ex. xxviii. Briefly, **the coat** was the long tunic of fine linen worn next the skin. According to Josephus (*Ant.* III. 7, § 2), it reached to the feet, and was fastened closely to the arms. It was to be "embroidered" (Ex. xxviii. 39), *i. e.*, woven, all of the same material and color, in diaper work. From Ex. xxviii. 40, 41; xxxix. 27, this garment appears to have been the same for the high-priest and the common priests. The girdle next mentioned is not the "*curious* girdle" of the Ephod (חֵשֶׁב), but the אַבְנֵט described by Josephus (*loc. cit.*) as a long sash of very loosely woven linen, embroidered with flowers of scarlet, and purple, and blue, which was wound several times around the body and tied, the ends hanging down to the ankles ordinarily, but thrown over the shoulder when the priest was engaged in active duty.—**The robe** (Ex. xxviii. 31-35), wholly of blue, was woven without seam, apparently without sleeves, with a hole whereby it was put over the head. It is supposed to have reached a little below the knees, and to have been visible below, and also a little above, the Ephod. The hem at the bottom was ornamented with "pomegranates, blue, and purple, and scarlet," with golden bells between them, which should sound as the high-priest went in and out of the holy place. Over this was the Ephod (Ex. xxviii. 6, 7; xxxix. 2-4), a vestment whose construction is imperfectly understood. The word etymologically, means simply a "vestment," and a simple "linen Ephod" was worn by the common priests (1 Sam. xxii. 18), as well as by others engaged in religious services (1 Sam. ii. 18; 2 Sam. vi. 14; 1 Chr. xv. 27). The "vestment" or Ephod of the high-priest here spoken of, however, was a very different and much more gorgeous affair. Its material was שֵׁשׁ = *fine linen* (of which also

the tunic mentioned above was made), while that of the other Ephods was בַּד or common linen of which the "linen breeches" were made. (The latter word, however, as the more general, is sometimes used for both, Lev. vi. 10 (3); xvi. 4, 23, 32). The Ephod of the high-priest appears to have been made in two parts, one for the back and one for the breast, joined at the shoulders by two onyx stones set in gold, upon which were engraved the names of the tribes of Israel. To these stones were attached chains of pure wreathen gold for the support of the breast-plate. According to Josephus (*loc. cit.*, § 5), it had sleeves and a place left open upon the breast to be covered by the breast-plate. It was woven with gold thread and colors "with cunning work," and with its attachments was one of the chief parts of the high-priest's attire. Upon it, wrought of the same costly and gorgeous materials, was the **curious girdle of the Ephod**, woven on to one of the parts, and passing round the body, holding them both together. On this was put the breast-plate (Ex. xxviii. 15-30), a separate piece of cloth woven of the same materials, so that when folded it was "a span" square. By gold rings it was attached to the chains from the onyx stones on the shoulder, and by other gold rings it was tied with bands of blue lace to corresponding rings on the Ephod. To this breast-plate were attached by settings of gold, twelve precious stones, on each of which was engraved the name of one of the tribes of Israel.—**Also he put in the breast-plate the Urim and the Thummim.**—On these words many volumes have been written, and we can only here refer to the note on Ex. xxviii. 30. From the way in which they are spoken of both there (comp. vers. 15-21) and here, they appear to have been something different from the precious stones before spoken of, and to have been placed, not *on*, but *in* the breast-plate, *i. e.*, in the receptacle formed by its fold, although a great variety of authorities might be cited for the opposite view. There is nowhere any direction given for their preparation, and from the use of the definite article with each of them, it is likely that they were things already known. They were used as a means of ascertaining the will of God (Num. xxvii. 21; 1 Sam. xxviii. 6, *etc.*); but by precisely what process is not known, and there are now no means of ascertaining. The many conjectures concerning them are conveniently arranged by Clark (*Speaker's Com.*) under three heads: (1) that the Divine will was manifested by some physical effect addressed to the eye or ear; (2) that they were a means of calling into action a prophetic gift in the high-priest; (3) that they were some contrivance for casting lots. The Urim and Thummim were here formally delivered to Aaron, and passed on to his successors; but the last recorded instance of their use is in the time of David, and they seem to have passed into disuse as revelations and teachings by prophets became more frequent. It is certain that they had disappeared, or their use had been lost, after the return from the captivity (Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65).

And he put the mitre upon his head.—(Ex. xxviii. 37-39). The word *mitre* is here used in its etymological sense, of a twisted band of fine linen around the head, which might now be described as a *turban*. **The golden plate, the holy crown,**—a plate of pure gold having engraved on it HOLINESS TO THE LORD. This was attached to a "blue lace," whereby it was fastened to the mitre. It was the crowning glory of the high-priest's official dress, and its symbolism is fully expressed in the command for its preparation (Ex. xxviii. 38), "that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the LORD." This completed the investiture of Aaron, and it is added **as the LORD commanded Moses**, both to show that the command had been fulfilled, and also that only that which was commanded had been done. In this matter nothing was left to human device; every particular was expressly arranged by minute Divine directions; for everything was symbolic and intended gradually to teach Israel spiritual truths, which as yet they were only prepared to learn by these sensible images.

Vers. 10–12. **The anointing of the sacred things and of Aaron.**

The composition of the anointing oil, and the careful restriction of its use had been minutely commanded (Ex. xxx. 22-33). The Rabbis say that the art of compounding it was lost after the captivity, and hence from that time its use was necessarily discontinued. The things to be anointed had all been made "after the pattern shown in the Mount" (Ex. xxv. 40; Heb. ix. 23) and expressly for their sacred uses; yet there was a fitness, such as has always been recognized by the sense of mankind, that they should first be especially set apart by a solemn ceremonial for their holy purpose. **The tabernacle and all that was therein.**—In Ex. xxx. 26–28, many of the things are specially mentioned, showing that Moses with the anointing oil must have passed not only into the holy place but into the holy of holies itself.

Ver. 11. **He sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times.**—This refers to the brazen altar in the court, as is shown by the things enumerated with it. On the seven-fold sprinkling see on iv. 6. **And anointed the altar.**—As this is a different act from the sprinkling, so does this special sanctifying of the altar seem appropriate to its use in the sacrifices.

Ver. 12. **He poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head.**—Comp. Ps. cxxxiii. 2. "The anointing with oil was a symbol of endowment with the Spirit of God (1 Sam. x. 1, 6; xvi. 13, 14; Isa. lxi. 1) for the duties of the office to which a person was consecrated," Keil. The A. V. is quite accurate in marking the more abundant anointing of Aaron by the word **poured**. The symbolism of anointing is abundantly recognized in the New Test. as applied to Christ (Luke iv. 18; Acts x. 38, *etc.*). There has been much question whether the sons of Aaron were also here anointed. On the one hand, it had been commanded that they should be anointed (Ex. xxviii. 41; xl. 15) "thou shalt anoint them as thou didst anoint their father," and they are always recognized as having been

anointed (vii. 36; x. 7); and on the other hand, there is no mention here of this having been done (which could hardly have been omitted had it taken place); and as Aaron was first robed, and then anointed, while his sons were not yet robed, it seems necessary to consider their unction as having been confined to the sprinkling with mingled oil and blood of ver. 30. This would be quite in accordance with the recognition of the high-priest alone as *the* anointed priest and with all those passages in which his anointing is spoken of as something peculiar. (The word *as* in Ex. xl. 15 cannot, of course, be pressed—as Kalisch insists—to mean an exactly similar form of anointing).

Ver. 13. Next comes the robing of Aaron's sons, all in accordance with the commands so often referred to. The **bonnets** were also a sort of turban, but it may be inferred from the difference in the Heb. word that they were probably differently fashioned from that of the high-priest.

Vers. 14–30. The sacrifices and accompanying ceremonies.

In the order of the sacrifices the sin offering comes first, then the burnt offering, lastly the peace offering; this, the normal order, is always observed (unless in certain exceptional cases) where the several kinds of sacrifice come together, as was evidently fitting in view of the special object of each.

The victim and the ritual of the sin offering are the same as that appointed for the sin offering of the high-priest in ch. iv. 3-12, except that the blood was not brought into the sanctuary nor sprinkled "before the vail." The reason commonly assigned for this is that the offering was not for any particular sin, but only for a general state of sinfulness. So Lange. But it is to be borne in mind that this sacrifice was not for Aaron alone, but for him and his sons together; also it was not for an already consecrated high-priest, but for one who was in the very act of being consecrated and not yet entitled to discharge the functions of the high-priest. In view of what he was to be, the victim might well be the same as that appointed for the ordinary sin offering of the high-priest; in view of what he actually was, it was fitting that there should be a difference in the ritual as regards the blood. **Moses took the blood and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger**, as was done in all sin offerings, only here the object of the act seems to have been, in part at least, the altar itself. This had been already sprinkled and anointed; now by the blood it is still further **purified**, and also **sanctified**, and atonement made for it. On the necessity of the blood in addition to the oil, see Heb. ix. 21, 22. The application of this to the altar was for the same general reasons as in case of the tabernacle and its contents, only that there was especial emphasis in regard to the altar on account of its peculiar use. As all things in heaven and earth are reconciled unto God by the blood of the cross (Col. i. 20), so must these typical things be reconciled by the blood of the typical sacrifice.

In all this service Moses, by a special Divine commission, acts as the priest. Hence he is spoken of in Ps. xcix. 6 as "among His priests," and Philo calls him a high-priest. He did not, however, wear the priestly garments, and strictly he was not a priest at all. He had hitherto acted as priest (Ex. xl. 23), although he had not before offered a sin offering; but now he was both less and more than a priest. Less, in that with this consecration his priestly functions absolutely ceased; more, in that he now acts on God's behalf as the Mediator of the Old Covenant (Gal. iii. 19). The Aaronic priesthood was continued with its powers by hereditary succession; but all chains must have a beginning, and all authority must have a giver. Here the first link of the chain, the beginning of all priestly authority, is given by Moses acting under an express commission for this purpose, from the Almighty. It is to be remembered that all these sacrifices were consumed by fire kindled in the ordinary way, the fire "from before the LORD" (ix. 24) not having yet come forth.

Vers. 18–21. The burnt offering differed in nothing from the ordinary burnt offering, although the victim was of a kind less commonly selected.

Vers. 22–30. The peace offering, or ram of consecration. Any sacrificial animal might be offered in the ordinary peace offerings; but a ram, as here, was required along with a bullock for the priestly peace offering immediately after their consecration (ix. 4-8), and a ram alone at the fulfilment of the Nazarite vow (Num. vi. 14, 17), and this also formed a part of the varied peace offerings of the princes after the dedication of the altar and tabernacle (Num. vii. 17, 23, *etc.*).

Ver. 22. **The ram of consecration**, lit. "the ram of the fillings," *i. e.* with which the hands of Aaron and his sons were to be filled for the wave-offering, ver. 27, and by this phraseology is the idea of consecration usually expressed according to the Hebrew idiom (comp. the verb in Judg. xvii. 5, 12; 1 Kings xiii. 33; Ezek. xliii. 26, *etc.*). The LXX. renders it κριὸν τελειώσεως=the ram of perfecting, inasmuch as this was the completion of the consecration, and signified that the priest was now enabled henceforth to offer sacrifice to God. Wordsworth aptly compares it to the delivery of the Bible to one being ordained to the ministry in the early Christian Church to signify that he was now entitled to exercise his office of dispensing God's word to the people. Lange gives another view of the sense: "The fact that Aaron too, and his sons, belonged to the congregation, and with it must bring offerings of their fulness towards the support that they received from it, is expressed in the command that they shall offer a second ram as a sacrifice of *Fulnesses*." And further: "Knobel gives *Ordination offering*; Keil, *Peace offering*. The peace or thank offering, however, was not brought until the eighth day, and all the particulars in this chapter belong to ordination offerings. It is then the offering of the fulness of his emoluments, which indeed belongs to the true priestly character."

Ver. 24. **Upon the tip of their right ear.** —Whether the upper or the lower extremity of the ear is meant is disputed, and is immaterial.

"He touched the extreme points, which represented the whole, of the ear, hand, and foot on the right, or more important and principal side: the *ear* because the priest was always to hearken to the word and commandment of God; the *hand*, because he was to discharge the priestly functions properly; and the *foot*, because he was to walk correctly in the sanctuary. Through this manipulation the three organs employed in the priestly service were placed, by means of their tips, *en rapport* with the sacrificial blood." Keil (quoted in part by Lange). By the subsequent sprinkling of the same blood upon the altar all was associated especially with sacrifice, the pre-eminent priestly function. It is noticeable that the same parts of the cleansed leper were in the same way to be touched with the blood of his trespass offering (xiv. 14). In regard to the choice of the members on the right side, Theodoret (Qu. 8 *in Lev.*) significantly notes that "there are also left-handed actions and obedience of condemnation."

Vers. 25-28. The ritual of the wave offering is the same as in case of the ordinary peace offerings; only Aaron and his sons are here the offerers, and hence the portions waved were burned upon the altar, instead of being eaten by the priests. Lange says: "The command is to be particularly noticed, that the prophet should take this offering of the priests from their hands, and burn it upon the altar. The prophetical spirit must support the priesthood in the swinging and upheaving from the earth without which it is lost."

Ver. 29. **Moses took the breast.**—This also he **waved for a wave offering**, but not on Aaron's hands. This was done by special command, and was not the part belonging ordinarily to the officiating priest himself, but to the priestly order generally. The parts belonging to the officiating priest were burned upon the altar: as if to show that Moses, by thus officiating for the moment under a peculiar authorization, did not become actually a priest, although he might be in some sense connected with the priestly order.

Ver. 30. The sprinkling of Aaron and his sons and their garments once more, and now with the oil mingled with the blood of the sacrifice, completes the consecration service of this and each succeeding day. Lange: "The combination of the anointing oil and the blood of the sacrifice, of the life of the Spirit and the joyfulness of death, poured out over everything that was priestly, is here the typical ground-idea." This is the only unction of the sons of Aaron that is recorded; but it seems quite enough to constitute them anointed priests.

Ver. 31. Of the flesh of this sacrifice Aaron and his sons must eat; but no one else might share with them (Ex. xxix. 33), not even Moses. In this it was sharply distinguished from the ordinary peace offering; and this distinction was further marked by the command that it should be eaten within the court of the tabernacle, and that only on the same day, and in its accompanying oblation there was no leavened bread. It was a priestly peace offering, and was to be eaten by Aaron and his sons as inchoate priests.

Ver. 34. Rosenmüller notes that "the verb עָשָׂה is here to be taken passively, as often אָמַר and קָרָא. See 1 Sam. xxiii. 22; Gen. xvi. 14."

Vers. 32-35. Lange: "Seven days they were to pass in holy seclusion in the court, seven days they were to bring the appointed sacrifices and to live on their sacrifice of consecration; what remained of it might not be devoted to common uses, but must be burned. So for seven days they were to keep holy watch, the watch of Jehovah in the court of the tabernacle, under the penalty of death. Moses makes particularly prominent the symbolic force of this divine watch; it is Jehovah's express commandment. Keil makes plain, however, that they might still go out in certain emergencies."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The whole matter of atonement, both in the sacrifices and in the priesthood, depended upon the Divine appointment; neither of them had any virtue or power to do away with human sin in themselves. Hence they could have been but types (since the Divine government is ever a reality), and looked forward to a Sacrifice which should have value, and a Priest who should have power, to accomplish in reality that which is here foreshadowed, and restore man to communion with God by giving him that holiness which is an essential prerequisite, and yet which of himself he can never attain.

II. By the fact that none could be a priest except by Divine appointment was taught under the old dispensation the truth so much emphasized in the new, that salvation is wholly of God's free grace. No sacrifice for sin could bleed, no priest could sprinkle the blood, except as God Himself allowed and commanded.

III. Moses, who was not a priest, who had never been anointed, consecrated Aaron, and by Divine command communicated to another that which he did not himself have. This illustrates the fact that God is not Himself limited by the limitations He has placed upon man. He can use for a priest one to whom the priesthood, except for this use, has not been communicated.

IV. Although God appointed, and Moses ministered, yet must all the people be summoned to witness the consecration of the priests, and by their presence give their assent. This as all other parts of the Levitical system was of the nature of a covenant. God alone could proclaim the laws; but it is of the people to promise obedience: God alone could constitute men priests; but it is for the people to accept and avail themselves of their mediation.

V. Lange on ver. 13: "And now first are the assistants spoken of. The whole priesthood is concentrated in the anointed priest, the head priest, the high-priest: a symbol which has been fulfilled in Christ, but not a second time in an inferior symbol."

VI. In this chapter of Leviticus and the corresponding one of Exodus the consecration of Aaron is frequently expressed in the LXX. by the verb τελειόω and its derivative τελείωσις; and correspondingly, with express reference to this

law, the same word is applied to the consecration of Christ in Heb. ii. 10; vii. 28. He was consecrated in the sufferings of the cross, and thenceforward continues our high-priest and intercessor for evermore.

VII. The washing of Aaron and his sons, the linen drawers, and the linen tunic express as clearly and emphatically as is possible to symbolism the absolute necessity of inward purity in those who would draw near to God.

VIII. The culmination of the high-priest's vestments was in the golden plate on his forehead, and on this was inscribed "holiness to the LORD." This then was the culmination of the Levitical, as of every other dispensation; the one point towards which all lines of precept and of ceremony, of plain Divine command and of symbolical teaching converge is "Holiness to the LORD."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

As Moses by Divine appointment was able to consecrate Aaron, so may any one, in the power of God, become to another the channel of grace which he himself may not possess; one's own deficiencies are then no sufficient bar to work for others. Moses summoned all the people: there are none without interest in the means provided for the atonement for sin. The Sept. here (vers. 3, 4) used the word ἐκκλησιάζω (var. lect. ἐκκλησία), and this is the first place where that word or ἐκκλησία occurs; Cyril of Jerusalem hence notes that the *Church* is thus presented to us first when Aaron, the type of Christ, is invested with the high-priesthood. Aaron was first washed, then vested; Origen thereupon remarks (Hom. 6 *in Lev.* § 2) that except the Christian be washed from his sins, he cannot put on the Lord Jesus Christ. Comp. Rev. i. 5, 6. "So our great High Priest was publicly inaugurated in the presence of a large multitude by His baptism. . . . . So all Christians, who "are made priests to God" in Christ, are initiated into their priesthood in baptism." Wordsw. With the symbolical setting apart for holy uses of the sacred vessels compare the expressions in the N. Test. "chosen vessel" (Acts ix. 15), vessels to honor and to dishonor, and vessels of wrath (Rom. ix. 21–23), *etc.* "The ephod bearing the onyx stones on the shoulder straps, with the breast-plate containing the Urim and the Thummim, is symbolic of the priestly function. . . . . The holy crown, with its legible and intelligible motto, indicates the holiness and authority which appertain to the royal Priest. And in their correlation, the stones on the shoulder especially denote the priestly, those on the breast-plate the prophetic, and the golden plate on the forehead the kingly, function of the Mediator." Murphy. As Aaron and his sons must be anointed to become priests, so, says St. John, has Christ communicated an unction to the Christian which "abideth" in him (1 John ii. 20, 27). The three sacrifices of the consecration, the sin, the burnt, and the peace offering, as they together represent the three-fold fulness of the one sacrifice of Christ, so do they point out the three-fold duty by which Christians may obtain the benefits of that sacrifice, and thereby become "priests unto God," *viz.* death unto sin, fulness of obedience, and communion with God. Aaron was consecrated by these sacrifices to be a priest "offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins;" but "Christ, "after He had offered one sacrifice for sins forever," "hath perfected (τετελείωκεν, hath consecrated as priests) forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14). Wordsworth. When Moses had gathered the people, he explained to them what he was about to do (ver. 5), that they might be intelligent witnesses; so is the service of God ever a *reasonable* service. Aaron's ear, hand and foot were touched with the anointing oil as well as himself sprinkled; so must each single faculty of those who have "the unction from the Holy One" be especially sanctified and consecrated to God's service, as well as the whole body soul and spirit be generally devoted to Him, for the general only becomes concretely real in the particulars. In the mingling of the blood and oil (ver. 30) for the anointing seems to be taught that not sacrifice for sin alone suffices; but that with this must be joined the unction of the Holy Spirit. If only sin is put out without anything being taken in, the house is but swept and garnished for its old occupant. With the watch of the now partially consecrated priests seven days in the court of the tabernacle, compare the waiting of the Apostles in Jerusalem after our Lord's ascension until endued at Pentecost with power from on high. And with this, too, compare the life-long watch of every Christian; he has already received an unction from on high, but waits in this earthly tabernacle until he shall be called at last to enter into the Holy of holies.

SECOND SECTION.

Entrance of Aaron and his Sons on their Office.

Chap. IX. 1–24.

1 And it came to pass on the eighth day, *that* Moses called Aaron and his sons,
2 and the elders[1] of Israel; and he said unto Aaron, Take thee a young [bull[2]] calf
for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering, without blemish, and offer *them*
3 before the Lord. And unto the children[1] of Israel thou shalt speak, saying, Take
ye a kid [buck[3]] of the goats for a sin offering; and a calf and a lamb [sheep[4]]
4 *both* of the first year, without blemish, for a burnt offering: also a bullock and a
ram for peace offerings, to sacrifice before the Lord; and a meat offering [an
oblation[5]] mingled with oil: for to-day the Lord will appear unto you.

5 And they brought *that* which Moses commanded before[6] the tabernacle of the
congregation: and all the congregation drew near and stood before the Lord.
6 And Moses said, This *is* the thing which the Lord commanded that ye should do:[7]
7 and the glory of the Lord shall appear unto you. And Moses said unto Aaron,
Go unto the altar, and offer thy sin offering, and thy burnt offering, and make an
atonement for thyself, and for the people:[8] and offer the offering of the people, and
make an atonement for them: as the Lord commanded.

8 Aaron therefore went unto the altar, and slew the calf of the sin offering, which
9 *was* for himself. And the sons of Aaron brought the blood unto him: and he
dipped his finger in the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar, and poured
10 out the blood at the bottom of the altar: but the fat, and the kidneys, and the caul
above the liver of the sin offering, he burnt upon the altar: as the Lord com-
11 manded Moses. And the flesh and the hide he burnt with fire without the camp.
12 And he slew the burnt offering; and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood,
13 which he sprinkled round about upon the altar. And they presented the burnt
offering unto him, with [according to[9]] the pieces thereof and the head: and he
14 burnt *them* upon[10] the altar. And he did wash the inwards and the legs, and burnt
them upon the burnt offering on the altar.

15 And he brought the people's offering, and took the goat, which *was* the sin offer-
ing for the people, and slew it, and offered it for sin [a sin offering[11]], as the first.
16 And he brought the burnt offering, and offered it according to the manner [ordi-
17 nance[12]]. And he brought the meat offering [oblation[5]], and took an handful
thereof, and burnt *it* upon the altar, beside the burnt sacrifice of the morning.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. For זְקֵנֵי the Sam. and LXX. read בְּנֵי, but change the reading in the opposite way in ver. 3. Rosenmüller considers these elders as the same with the עֵדָה and the קָהָל of ch. viii.

[2] Ver. 2. עֵגֶל בֶּן-בָּקָר, lit. *calf son of a bull*=a bull calf, or yearling bull.

[3] Ver. 3. שְׂעִיר עִזִּים. See note [21] on iv. 23.

[4] Ver. 3. See note [5] on ii. 7.

[5] Ver. 4. Oblation. See note [2] on ii. 1. The Vulg. adds *in singulo sacrificiorum*, for each of the sacrifices.

[6] Ver. 5. The A. V. more exactly expresses the Sam. לִפְנֵי (comp. vers. 2, 4) than the Heb. אֶל-פְּנֵי.

[7] Ver. 6. Horsley would here change the punctuation and read—which the Lord commanded: Do it, and the glory, *etc.*; but this would require also the insertion of a pronoun.

[8] Ver. 7. For *the people* the LXX. reads τοῦ οἴκου σοῦ.

[9] Ver. 13. לְנִתְחֶיהָ=according to its pieces (into which the burnt offering was divided, i. 6). So the Ancient Versions generally. So Knobel and Keil.

[10] Ver. 13. The preposition עַל is wanting in the Sam.

[11] Ver. 15. The word of course bears either sense; but the context here clearly requires that of sin-offering.

[12] Ver. 16. כַּמִּשְׁפָּט. The margin is clearly better than the text of the A. V. The ordinance has been given in ch. i.

18 He slew also the bullock and the ram *for* a sacrifice of peace offerings, which *was*
for the people: and Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, which he sprinkled
19 upon the altar round about, and the fat of the bullock and of the ram, the rump
[fat tail[13]], and that which covereth *the inwards*, and the kidneys, and the caul
20 *above* the liver: and they[14] put the fat upon the breasts, and he burnt the fat upon
21 the altar: and the breasts and the right shoulder Aaron waved *for* a wave offering
before the LORD; as Moses[15] commanded.
22 And Aaron lifted up his hand [hands[16]] toward the people, and blessed them,
and came down from offering of the sin offering, and the burnt offering, and peace
23 offerings. And Moses and Aaron went into the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congre-
gation, and came out and blessed the people: and the glory of the LORD appeared
unto all the people.
24 And there came a fire out from before the LORD, and consumed upon the altar
the burnt offering and the fat: *which* when all the people saw,[17] they shouted, and
fell on their faces.

[13] Ver. 19. Fat tail. See note [7] on iii. 9.
[14] Ver. 20. The Sam. has the sing., *he put.*
[15] Ver. 21. The Sam., LXX., Targ. Onk. and 30 MSS. צִוָּה יְהוָה אֶת מֹשֶׁה=as the LORD commanded Moses.
[16] Ver. 22. The k'ri has יְדֵין in the plural, according with the vowel points; so 20 MSS. and all the ancient versions except the Sam. The plural is probably correct.
[17] Ver. 24. The Heb. verb is singular; but the Sam. has the plural.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

It is noticed by Nicholas de Lyra, that this chapter has three essential parts: (1) the commands (vers. 1-7); (2) the execution of them (vers. 8-22); (3) the Divine approbation of what was done (vers, 23, 24). The second part may be subdivided into Aaron's offerings for himself, vers. 8-14; and his offerings for the people, vers. 15-21. Here begins a new Proper Lesson of the law for reading in the Synagogue extending through ch. xi.; the parallel Proper Lesson from the Prophets being 2 Sam. vi. 1—vii. 17, which gives the account of David's bringing up the ark to Mt. Zion and his purpose to build a temple for it there.

Ver. 1. **On the eighth day**, *viz.*, from the beginning of Aaron's consecration. That had occupied seven days, and his entrance upon his office now immediately followed on the next day, there being no cause for delay, and every reason why the priesthoood should be in the active exercise of its duties at once. His priesthood was still somewhat inchoate, for he had yet discharged none of its functions, and had not entered into the sanctuary. This affects the character of the sacrifices prescribed. On the first day of the first month the tabernacle had been set up (Ex. xl. 17), and the Passover was kept on the fourteenth day (Num. ix. 2, 5); the seven days' consecration came between, and there remained therefore but a few days before the preparation for the Passover. We have no data for determining the day of the week. **The elders of Israel** are now summoned because they have to act officially in presenting the offerings for the people; but doubtless the mass of the people were also, as far as might be, witnesses of the entrance of Aaron upon his office (ver. 5, comp. ver. 24).

Ver. 2. **Take thee.**—Aaron is to furnish his own victims at his own proper cost. The victim for the sin offering was to be **a bull calf**, or quite young bullock, an inferior offering to that prescribed for the high-priest in iv. 3. For this various reasons have been assigned: as that this was not for any particular sin, but for general sinfulness (Poole and others); that it had reference to Aaron and the people's sin in the golden calf (Ex. xxxii.), and was designed to remind him and them of it (Maimonides, Patrick, Nich. de Lyra, and others); that the greater sin offering was unnecessary, as Aaron and his sons had spent the whole previous week in services of atonement and of holiness; but the more important reason is that given by Kalisch, "Not even on the eighth day had Aaron's dignity reached its full independence and glory; it still remained, to a certain degree, under the control of Moses, who gave commands to his brother, as he had received them from God. Therefore Aaron was not permitted to pass beyond the court; he was not yet qualified to appear in the immediate presence of God." In a word, the inchoateness of his priesthood was marked in the victim and its ritual. **A ram for a burnt offering.**—Any male sacrificial animal was allowed for a burnt offering, but here the most impressive kind is not chosen for the reason just given. No peace offering is prescribed for the priests, because their share in the offerings of the people was quite enough for so small a company, and sufficed for the common feast of communion with God. The order of the offerings, the sin offering first, the peace offering last, has been noticed in the previous chapter.

Ver. 3. **Thou shalt speak.**—Moses now passes over to Aaron the duty of directing the people in their sacrifices as their appointed and consecrated high-priest. The offerings for the people are: first, the sin offering, which is not that prescribed for the sin of the whole people (iv. 14), but for the sin of a prince (iv. 23), the reason for which generally given is that this was not for a particular sin, but only for general sinfulness; but it seems fit that this sin offering should have been reduced in proportion to

Aaron's, and for the same reason. Second, the burnt offering, which was to consist of two victims, and yet was much less than on occasions of special solemnity (Num. xxviii. 11, 27, *etc.*). Third, the peace offering, which was just enough for the purpose of the symbolical sacrificial feast, but yet too small for any considerable festivity in view of the solemn manifestation to follow (vers. 4, 6, 24).

Ver. 6. Moses, as before, explains what is to be done that thus the people may be intelligent witnesses. He announces beforehand the appearance of the **glory of the LORD** (see ver. 23), showing that he did all this by appointment, and when it appeared it thus established his authority; and also that the people, by these sacrifices, might be prepared for this manifestation. "The crown of this typical worship was to consist in this: **To-day the LORD will appear to you**; and again, **this is the thing which the LORD hath commanded** that ye should do, and the **glory of the Lord shall appear to you.**" Lange.

Ver. 7. **Go unto the altar.**—Aaron is now to enter upon his office, and for the first time ascend the slope of the altar. **Make an atonement for thyself and for the people.**—This is distinct from the atonement for the people in the sacrifice of their sin offering, mentioned in the next clause, and finds its explanation in that guilt brought upon the people by the sin of the high-priest (iv. 3). So Keil rightly. For this Aaron was to atone in making his own atonement, and then afterwards to offer for their own sins. Lange says, "The subsequent command in regard to these offerings has this import: with his especial sacrifice Aaron should atone for himself and for the people as a whole (הָעָם), but with the sacrifice of the congregation, he should atone for each single member of the congregation."

Vers. 8–11. Aaron first offers his own sin offering, his sons assisting him in those duties which were afterwards assigned to the Levites. The ritual is the same as that provided in ch. iv., except that the blood is not brought into the Sanctuary (into which Aaron had not yet entered, comp. ver. 23), for the reasons given under ver. 2; but the flesh and hide is nevertheless burnt without the camp as required in iv. 11, 12, the victim is slain by Aaron,—either by himself, or by his assistants,—(ver. 8) as in the other high-priestly sin offerings (iv. 1, 2, 4) and the blood is put with his finger upon the *horns* of the altar as in case of the other regular sin offerings (iv. 25, 30, 34).

Vers. 12–14. The burnt offering for Aaron and his sons was offered in the regular way according to the *ordinance* of ch. i. After being divided the pieces were presented to Aaron, one by one, by his sons to be laid upon the altar. No mention is made of an oblation with this sacrifice, either because it is supposed as of course, or else because it actually was not brought, the law of Num. xv. 4 not having yet been given.

Vers. 15–21. The sacrifices for the people follow in the same order. In regard to all the previous offerings it is expressly said that Aaron *burnt* them; the same thing is also said (ver. 20) of the parts of the peace offering that were destined for the altar, and it is clearly implied in regard to the others by the expression **as the first** (ver. 15) in regard to the sin offering; and in regard to the burnt offering, both by the statement of ver. 16, and by the mention of the burning of the accompanying oblation in ver. 17. These were all therefore burned at first by fire kindled by ordinary means. It would, however, thus have taken many hours to consume them in the ordinary way, and the miracle of ver. 24 refers to their being immediately consumed by the "fire from before the LORD." The LXX., however, in vers. 13 and 17, instead of *burnt* renders *laid*, and this seems to have been in the mind of Lange when he says "Aaron has laid all the pieces rightly upon the altar of burnt offering, and blessed the people from the elevated position of the steps (*stiege*) of the altar. The sacrifice is ready, this is the part of the priestly body; but the fire must come from the LORD." In regard to the burning instead of eating the flesh of the sin offering, see x. 16-20.

Ver. 17. **The burnt sacrifice of the morning.**—Was this the regular morning sacrifice of the lamb offered by Aaron after the sacrifices for himself and before those for the people, but not otherwise mentioned because it was of course? Or is it identical with the lamb of the burnt offering for the people, so that the morning sacrifice to be offered ever after is here inaugurated, as is argued by Murphy? The former view seems the more probable both because the offering of the morning sacrifice had already been begun by Moses (Ex. xl. 29) upon the first erection of the tabernacle and before Aaron's consecration; and because the lamb of this offering is evidently spoken of (ver. 3) as a part of the special burnt offering for the people on this occasion.

Ver. 22. **Lifted up his hands.**—In pronouncing a blessing upon an individual it was customary to lay the hands upon his head (Gen. xlviii. 14, *etc.*); but this being impossible in the case of a multitude, the custom was to lift the hands, as was also often done in other prayers, and this custom has been most scrupulously preserved in the Jewish usages to the present day. *Hands* rather than *hand* is the more probable reading, and is also accordant with the Jewish tradition. No command had been given for this act, but it was a natural sequence of the entrance of Aaron upon his office, a part of which was to bless the people in the name of the LORD. The blessing was pronounced while Aaron stood upon the elevated slope (not steps, Ex. xx. 26) of the altar. In the following words, **came down from offering**, we have a further evidence that the victims had been actually laid upon the fire.

Ver. 23. **Went into the tabernacle.**—Moses enters, not as priest, but to complete the initiation of Aaron into his duties; for the latter had not yet entered the sanctuary. Much of the priestly duty, the burning of incense, the trimming of the sacred lamps, the ordering of the shew-bread, *etc.*, was hereafter to be within the tabernacle, and it was necessary that Aaron should be exactly instructed in all these matters. According to the Targum of Jonathan, they went in to pray for the promised manifestation of the

glory of the LORD; and it is not unlikely that the two brothers, the one the leader and lawgiver of Israel, now entering the sanctuary for the last time, and the other the appointed high-priest now entering for the first time, should then have united in solemn prayer for God's blessing upon the people. On their return, Moses laying down his temporary priestly functions, and Aaron taking up his permanent office, jointly blessed the people. (Comp. 2 Chron. vi. 3). In Numb. vi. 24-26 is prescribed the exact form of priestly benediction used ever afterwards; but there is no evidence that this form was now employed. One tradition makes the form like that of Ps. xc. 17; the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem give the following: "The Word of the LORD receive your offering with good pleasure, and may He overlook and pardon your sins."

And the glory of the Lord appeared.—This is sometimes considered as included in the *fire* of the following verse, but more generally and more probably is looked upon as some glorious manifestation in the cloud which covered the tabernacle (comp. Ex. xl. 34, 35), out of which came forth the fire. So Lange.

Ver. 24. **There came a fire.**—Similarly was the Divine approbation of sacrifices several times expressed in after ages, in the fire from the rock consuming Gideon's sacrifice; in the fire which fell upon the sacrifice of Elijah (1 Kings xviii. 38); in the answer to David's prayer at the threshing floor of Ornan by fire from heaven upon his altar (1 Chr. xxi. 26); and in the like fire consuming the sacrifices at Solomon's dedication of the temple (2 Chr. vii. 1). According to Jewish tradition the fire thus kindled was kept ever burning (whether by natural or supernatural means, the Rabbis differ) until the temple was built; then again kindled in the same way, it continued to burn until the reign of Manasseh. But it is to be remembered that the fire was not now first kindled upon the altar, but had already been burning there more than a week. However fully therefore it expressed the Divine approbation, and however reasonably the Israelites might wish to perpetuate such a fire, there is yet, as Keil justly remarks, no analogy between this and the legends of the heathen about altar fires kindled by the gods themselves. See the references in Knobel: Serv. *ad Æn.* 12, 200; Solin. 5, 23; Pausan. 5, 27, 3; Sueton. *Lib.* 14; Amm. Marc. 23, 6, 34. It is possible that this coming forth of the fire may have had a further object. In the Pantheistic philosophies of the East, fire was regarded as the universal principle of the Cosmos, and as inherent in all things. It is not likely that the Israelites, at this stage of their history, were brought into contact with this philosophy; but by this act they were taught that fire itself was sent from the LORD, and were thus guarded beforehand against these Pantheistic notions, which at a later period they must encounter.

Consumed upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat.—Patrick argues that this must have been at the time of the evening sacrifice, at which time also he shows that all the other instances of fire from heaven upon the sacrifice probably occurred, and that the burnt offering consumed was the lamb of the evening sacrifice. But the phraseology, **the burnt offering and the fat**, seems unmistakably to point to the burnt offering for the people and the fat of the peace offering already burning upon the altar. With the evening sacrifice there was no offering of fat apart from the lamb itself.

They shouted in wonder, thanksgiving and praise, and **fell on their faces** to worship with joyful awe as in 2 Chron. vii. 3.

The views of Lange upon this verse are expressed in the following extract: "And now comes Fire from the Lord, that is, still out of the tabernacle of the Covenant, and blazes upon the altar and consumes the offering. So speaks the primitive energetic faith, in which the medium of the Divine operation merges itself in the operation of God. It is the essential thing in the hierarchical, literal faith that every medium should be supposed to be away. Hence is the stone of the first tables of the law and the immediate writing of God; and we come on the path of priestly tradition down to the Easter fire in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. On the other hand, the medium is everything to the critical, negative, literal faith; for it, the matter is legend. But the primitive, religiously-inclined people, saw in the shining figures of Moses and Aaron, who came back out of the Sanctuary, and in the flaming up of the sacrificial fire, the glory of the Lord whose appearance from the Holy of Holies Moses and Aaron had besought. It was the first lifting up of the highly significant fire flame in their worship, whose typical prefiguration should be fulfilled in the atoning fiery operation over the cross of Christ, and—not frightened—but joyously, all the people fell on their faces."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. In Aaron's sin offering for himself and his sons, immediately after his consecration, and as his first priestly act, is shown most strikingly the imperfection of the Levitical priesthood. "This offering was probably regarded not so much a sacrifice for his own actual sins, as a typical acknowledgment of his sinful nature and of his future duty to offer for his own sins and those of the people" (Clark). "The law maketh men high-priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated forevermore." Heb. vii. 28.

II. If this was true of the high-priest, *à fortiori*, it was true of all other provisions of the Levitical law. "If, according to this, even after the manifold expiation and consecration which Aaron had received through Moses during the seven days, he had still to enter upon his service with a sin offering and a burnt offering, this fact clearly showed that the offerings of the law could not ensure perfection (Heb. x. 1 sqq.)." Keil.

III. The commentary upon this chapter bringing out its doctrinal significance, is to be found especially in the Ep. to the Heb. As other points are there brought out strikingly, so is this: "And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not Himself to be made an high-priest." Heb. v. 4, 5.

IV. In the appointment, in the consecration, and in the entrance of Aaron upon his official duties, his mediatorial functions are everywhere distinctly recognized. Thus is the necessity set forth of a Mediator between God and man, and as distinctly as was possible under a typical system is foreshadowed the office of Him who came to be man's true mediator with God.

V. In every possible way, by dress, by ablutions, by inscriptions on Aaron's frontlet, by varied sacrifice, the necessity of holiness in man's approach to God is declared. Yet this could only be typically attained by sinful man. Very plainly therefore did Aaron and his office point forward to that Seed of the woman who should bruise the serpent's head, and obtain the final victory in man's long struggle with the power of evil.

VI. In the order of the offerings of Aaron both for himself and the people is clearly expressed the order of the steps of approach to God; first, the forgiveness of sin, then the consecration completely to God, and after this communion with Him, and blessing from Him.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Moses, the great leader and law-giver of Israel, retires from his temporary priestly functions, and delivers them over to Aaron without a murmur, content to fulfil the Divine will. So John the Baptist found his joy fulfilled in that he must decrease while his Master increased (Jno. iii. 30). Moses did not seek to retain an office to which God had not called him, comp. Num. xvi.; Acts xix. 13-15; Heb. v. 4; Jude 11.

The "glory of the LORD" appeared, and was also manifested in Solomon's temple; the second temple was without it, and yet it was promised (Hag. ii. 9) that the glory of the latter temple should be greater than of the former. This was fulfilled when He whose glory was "as of the Only Begotten of the Father" appeared in His temple. And again, after the consecration of the Great High-Priest on Calvary, and His entrance by His ascension into the true sanctuary, the glory of the Lord was manifested at Pentecost. Wordsworth.

As Aaron after the sacrifice blessed the people before entering the sanctuary; so Christ, after His sacrifice upon the cross, blessed His disciples (Luke xxiv. 50) before passing into the heavens to continue there our Priest and Intercessor forevermore.

The glory appeared and the fire came forth *after* the consecration of the high-priest, and *after* his sacrifice, and *after* he had entered the sanctuary; even as the fire of Pentecost came after Christ's consecration in His sacrifice of Himself, and after He had passed into the heavens. And as the fire in the tabernacle showed the Divine approbation of the Levitical system, so that of Pentecost expressed His good pleasure in the Christian.

THIRD SECTION.

The Sin and the Punishment of Nadab and Abihu, with Instructions founded upon that Event.

CHAPTER X. 1–20.

1 AND Nadab and Abihu, the[1] sons of Aaron, took either of them his censer, and
put fire therein,[2] and put incense thereon,[2] and offered strange fire before the LORD,
2 which he commanded them not. And there went out fire from the LORD, and
3 devoured them, and they died before the LORD. Then Moses said unto Aaron,
This *is it* that the LORD spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh
4 me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron held his peace. And
Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and
said unto them, Come near, carry your brethren from before the sanctuary out of
5 the camp. So they went near, and carried[3] them in their coats out of the camp;
as Moses had said.
6 And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazer and unto Ithamar, his[4] sons, Un-

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. Three MSS., followed by the Vat. LXX., read "the two sons."

[2] Ver. 1. In the Heb. the first pronoun, בָּהֶן, is plural, while the second, עָלֶיהָ, is singular. 16 MSS., the Sam. LXX. and Syr. have the latter in the plural.

[3] Ver. 5. וַיִּשְׂאֵם. The fuller form וַיִּשָּׂאוּ אֹתָם is given in the Sam.

[4] Ver. 6. One MS., followed by the LXX. and Syr. specifies "his remaining sons."

cover[5] not your heads, neither rend your clothes; lest ye die, and lest wrath come upon all the people: but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the
7 burning which the LORD hath kindled. And ye shall not go out from the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, lest ye die: for the anointing oil of the LORD *is* upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.
8, 9 And the LORD spake unto Aaron,[6] saying, Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation,
10 lest ye die: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations: and[7] that ye may put difference between holy and unholy [common[8]], and between unclean and
11 clean; and that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the LORD hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.
12 And Moses spake unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take the meat offering [oblation[9]] that remaineth of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, and eat it without leaven beside the altar: for it *is* most holy:
13 and ye shall eat it in the [a] holy place, because it *is* thy due, and thy sons' due,
14 of the sacrifices of the LORD made by fire: for so I am commanded. And the wave breast and heave shoulder [leg[10]] shall ye eat in a clean place; thou, and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee: for *they be* thy due, and thy sons' due, *which* are given
15 out of the sacrifices of peace offerings of the children of Israel. The heave shoulder [leg[10]] and the wave breast shall they bring with the offerings made by fire of the fat, to wave *it for* a wave offering before the LORD; and it shall be thine, and thy sons'[11] with thee, by a statute for ever; as the LORD hath commanded.
16 And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, and, behold, it was burnt: and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron, *which were*
17 left *alive*, saying, Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it *is* most holy, and *God* hath given[12] it you to bear the iniquity of the con-
18 gregation, to make atonement for them[13] before the LORD? Behold, the blood of it was not brought in within the holy *place:* ye should indeed have eaten it in the
19 [a[14]] holy *place*, as I[15] commanded. And Aaron said unto Moses, Behold, this day have they offered their sin offering and their burnt offering before the LORD; and such things have befallen me: and *if* I had eaten the sin offering to day, should
20 it have been accepted in the sight of the LORD? And when Moses heard *that*, he was content.[16]

[5] Ver. 6. אַל־תִּפְרָעוּ. The A. V., *ye shall not uncover* is quite correct, and is the sense given in most of the ancient versions; but the Targ. of Onkelos, followed by several Jewish and other commentators, gives the very different sense *ye shall not let your hair grow*, derived from the use of פֶּרַע. Num. vi. 5 = hair.

[6] Ver. 8. Eight MSS. substitute the name of Moses for that of Aaron. The variation is unimportant; for, as Boothroyd suggests, the communication to Aaron may have been made through Moses.

[7] Ver. 10. The *and* at the beginning of ver. 10 is omitted in the Sam. and all other ancient versions except the Vulgate.

[8] Ver. 10. חֹל is in contrast to קֹדֶשׁ and means simply that which is not especially consecrated. The word *common* conveys the sense better than *unholy*.

[9] Ver. 12. Oblation. See Textual Note [2] on ii. 1.

[10] Vers. 14, 15. Leg. See Text. Note [30] on vii. 32.

[11] Ver. 15. The Sam. and LXX. add *and thy daughters'*, as in ver. 14.

[12] Ver. 17. The Syr. reads in the 1st person, *I have given.*

[13] Ver. 17. Thirteen MSS. read *for you* in the 2d person.

[14] Ver. 18. The Masoretic punctuation of בַּקֹּדֶשׁ here indicates the article; it would seem proper, however, to omit it according to invariable usage. All the versions make a distinction between the sanctuary, into which the blood had not been carried, and the court where the flesh should have been eaten. We can only express this by a change of the article.

[15] Ver. 18. Most of the versions have the passive, *as I was commanded*, and the LXX, ὃν τρόπον μοι συνέταξε κύριος.

[16] Ver. 20. Rosenmüller notes that "הַיִּיטַב *scribitur hic ἀνομαλῶς pro* הֵיִיטַב."

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

"We should expect here immediately the description of a great thank offering feast of the people. But instead of this we are told of a great misfortune which closes a sacrificial feast disturbed in the very beginning. The story is not of the thank offering feast of the people, the festal meal of the installation of the priests. The joy of the people was very soon destroyed by anxiety and fear; for the inadequacy of the typical sacrifice has soon come to light." Lange.

The events of this chapter occurred on the same day as those of the preceding (see ver. 19), that is on the day after their consecration when Aaron and his sons first entered upon the discharge of their priestly functions. Moses therefore still appears here, as in ch. ix., in a peculiar relation as introducing the new-made priests to their duties, taking care that all things should be rightly done, and communicating to them further instructions (vers. 3, 5, 12, 16).

Vers. 1–5. The sin, death and burial of Nadab and Abihu.

Ver. 1. **Nadab and Abihu**, being mentioned first in the genealogies (Ex. vi. 23; Num. xxvi. 60), are supposed to have been Aaron's eldest sons. They had been selected to accompany Moses and Aaron and the seventy elders in the beatific vision of Ex. xxiv. 1, 9. Wordsworth suggests that "perhaps they were 'exalted above measure through the abundance of their revelations' (2 Cor. xii. 7), and were tempted to imagine that they were not bound by ordinary rules in the discharge of the duties of the priest's office."

His censer.—מַחְתָּתוֹ. This is the first time the word is translated *censer* in the A. V., because it has occurred before only in connection with the golden candlestick (Ex. xxv. 38; xxxvii. 23), or as a pan for receiving the ashes from the brazen altar (Ex. xxvii. 3; xxxviii. 3). There can be no doubt, however, that it is rightly translated here in a sense in which it frequently occurs afterwards; but the fact that there is no previous mention of *censers* adds to the probability of some unrecorded command having already been given in regard to the offering of incense. The word מִקְטֶרֶת for censer is much later, occurring only 2 Chron. xxvi. 19; Ezek. viii. 11.

Put incense thereon.—Incense was to be burned upon the golden altar twice daily; in the morning, when the lamps of the golden candlestick were trimmed, and in the evening when they were lighted (Ex. xxx. 7, 8). It does not certainly appear from the narrative at what time the act of Nadab and Abihu occurred; but from the abundance of events that had already occurred on this day, it is not unlikely that the latter time was at hand. The unseasonableness of the time assigned by many commentators (Keil and others) as a part of their sin cannot therefore be maintained.—**And offered strange fire.**—The sin of Nadab and Abihu is always described in the same terms (Num. iii. 4; xxvi. 61); but in precisely what it consisted has been the occasion of much difference of opinion. By many (Kurtz and others) it is supposed to have consisted in the offering of incense not prepared according to the directions given in Ex. xxx. 34; but this would rather have been called "strange incense" as in Ex. xxx. 9, and it does not seem likely that the new priests, who had now been eight days in the court of the tabernacle, would have had ready access to any other incense, whereas other fire than that of the altar must have been in the court for cooking the flesh of the sacrifices. By others (as Keil) the sin is supposed to have been in offering the incense at a time not appointed; but it does not appear why such a fault should have been described as "strange fire," and moreover, as shown above, it seems not unlikely that it was actually the proper time for the burning of the evening incense. Knobel thinks that Nadab and Abihu proposed, of their own motion, to prepare an incense offering to accompany the shouts of the multitude as they saw the Divine fire fall upon the sacrifice—which may or may not have been the fact, as there is no evidence upon the point. Another supposition of Knobel must be absolutely rejected as at variance with the tenor of the narrative: "or, frightened by the consuming fire, ix. 24, they considered an appeasing of God necessary." It is better to follow the general opinion, and take the expression just as it is given, making their sin to have consisted in offering strange *fire*, that is fire other than that commanded. "The chief thing is that the strange or common fire forms a contrast to the fire of the Sanctuary." Lange. So Rosenmüller, Outram (l. xvi. 13), and others. In vi. 12 it is required that the fire should be always burning upon the altar, and as this fire was for the consumption of the sacrifices, it would naturally be understood for the burning of the incense; in xvi. 12 it is expressly prescribed for the incense on the great day of atonement, and it became a part of the symbolism of the sanctuary service (Rev. viii. 5). The fact that no command on this point of detail is anywhere recorded does not preclude the supposition that such a command had been given. At all events, the general principle of exact conformity to the Divine commands should have prevented Nadab and Abihu from offering "strange" or uncommanded fire before the LORD.

As to the causes which led them to commit this sin, the narrative is equally silent; but the connection of the precept in ver. 9 with this event seems to imply that there had been some violation of it. (See Targ. Hieros., Nic. de Lyra, Patrick, *etc.*) This might have concurred with already existing spiritual pride and self-will, or have temporarily produced them. "From vers. 8, 9, it is likely that they had lost their soberness in the feast which had begun." Lange. But however this may have been, Von Gerlach's remark is in place: "By this connection is taught, that as no external event was to depress with grief the priest, so ought he to apply no artificial means to his senses to produce exhilaration: his whole thoughts and attention are to be directed to the sacred offices which are commanded him. We are reminded of the antithesis, Eph. v. 18." In the expression **which he commanded them not**, Rosenmüller notes a *μείωσις* of frequent occurrence, meaning "which He forbade."

Ver. 2. **Fire from the LORD.**—Plainly a miraculous fire as that which consumed the sacrifice (ix. 24). It did not consume their bodies, or even their clothes (ver. 5), and it must have been by an inadvertence that Lange says: "If they came thus strongly excited with their glowing fire into the half darkness of the sanctuary, they may have set themselves a-fire, by which they were destroyed."

The severity of this judgment may be compared with that upon Uzza (2 Sam. vi. 7; 1 Chron. xiii. 10), upon the Sabbath-breaker (Num. xv. 32-36), or in the New Testament with that upon Ananias and Sapphira. In all these cases the punishment was not determined so much by the aggravation of the offence itself as by the necessity of vindicating God's majesty and by a signal judgment on the first occasion, preventing a repetition of the offence. In such cases it is very necessary to separate the temporal from the thought of eternal punishment.

Philo (as quoted by Calmet) undoubtedly pushes this too far when he says: "The priests Nadab and Abihu died that they might live, receiving an incorruptible for their mortal life, and passing from creatures to their Creator;" but yet we may not argue from temporal punishment to eternal doom, and the recollection of this may often serve to remove much of the inscrutableness of the Divine judgments.

Ver. 3. **This it is that the LORD spake**—not in precisely these words, but again and again in their substance. See Ex. xxix. 44; xix. 22; Lev. viii. 33. Yet the very words may have been spoken, although not recorded, as in Ex. xxxiii. 12. Priests are continually designated as those that "come nigh" to God (*e. g.* Ezek. xlii. 13).—**I will be sanctified.**—Comp. Ex. xix. 4, 5. "The law of the sanctuary is proclaimed to mean: that all approach to Jehovah of those who draw near to Him, of the priests in the holy acts of sacrifice, has the purpose of showing forth Jehovah in His holiness, *i. e.* in His pure and strict and all-folly-abhorring personality; and this hallowing of His name in highest solitude should have the result of revealing Him before all the people in His majesty, in the glory of His manifestation. The pure and brilliant exterior of the Cultus depends in its purity and chasteness upon the most perfect interior purity and truth. But when Moses applies this law to the present mishap, it expresses the truth that it is fulfilled not only in the pure service of God of good priests, but also in the unclean service of evil priests. Should these, for example, bring before the LORD, in passion or excitement, strange fire, fire of the intoxication of extravagance, fire of fanaticism, they should be seized and consumed by that fire changed, as it were, into the fire of the judgment of Jehovah; and also by such judgments on such priests Jehovah should be glorified before all His people—as it has always clearly been, especially to-day. How many a Protestant zealot has screamed himself dead in the sanctuary! But the mediæval priests began to burn themselves when they kindled the flames of the pyres." Lange.

Aaron held his peace means not only that he abstained from the customary wails and cries of the mourner; but that he uttered no murmur against the judgment of God, or remonstrance against the law as set forth by Moses. This may perhaps have been made easier to him by the stunning effect of so great and sudden a bereavement.

Ver. 4. **The sons of Uzziel.**—From Ex. vi. 18 it would appear that Uzziel was the youngest of Aaron's three uncles. **Brethren** is used, as so frequently in Scripture, in the sense of kinsmen. Elzaphan was the "chief" of his father's house, Num. iii. 30.—**From before the sanctuary.**—Notwithstanding the Jewish tradition that they perished within the sanctuary, it appears from this expression that the Divine judgment fell upon them while they were still in the court. "They buried the dead in their linen coats: these priestly garments had been defiled with the dead bodies, and were buried with them. There is nothing else degrading in the form of burial. The burial without the camp was common for all corpses. The buriers were also reminded that the dead were their brethren." Lange. This was now the eighth day of the month; the Passover lamb was to be slain on the 14th. Mishael and Elzaphan were therefore unable to keep the Passover on account of their defilement by a dead body, for this lasted seven days (Num. xix. 11–13). In view of these facts Blunt suggests (*Undesigned Coincidences*, I. 14) that it was the case of these Levites which was considered and provided for by the law of the Passover of the second month, Num. ix. 6-12.

Vers. 6, 7. All signs of mourning are forbidden to the priests. By a subsequent enactment these were in all cases perpetually forbidden to the high-priest (xxi. 10-12), but in moderation allowed to the ordinary priests for those nearest of kin (*ib.* 1–6). Here, however, they are absolutely forbidden to both, doubtless because "any manifestation of grief on account of the death that had occurred would have indicated dissatisfaction with the judgment of God" (Keil); "because, from their office, they were especially concerned as consecrated priests in outwardly maintaining the honor of Jehovah. . . . . The people, on the other hand, as not formally standing so near to Jehovah, were permitted to **bewail the burning which the Lord had kindled**" (Cook).

Uncover not your heads.—This is the sense of the LXX. and Vulg., and means that they were not to remove their priestly turbans, as they were still to go directly on with their priestly functions. The word means literally to *set free*, and it may therefore have here the added sense, "do not go about with your hair dishevelled, or flowing free and in disorder (xiii. 45)." Keil. Both this and the rending of the clothes were among the most common signs of mourning among the Jews.

Lest wrath come upon all the people.—They were to observe this precept not only for their own sake—**lest ye die**—but also for the people's. It has already been shown (iv. 3) that the sin of the high-priest, as their theocratic head, brought guilt upon the people, and involved them in the consequent punishment; in this case emphatically it must do so, because Aaron and his remaining sons were now the sole appointed mediators with God, and any mark of dissatisfaction with His judgments would have placed them in an attitude of opposition to God.

Though the priests might not turn aside from their sacred functions, yet Nadab and Abihu were not to go unmourned. **The whole house of Israel** were to **bewail the burning**—not indeed as murmuring against the Divine judgment, but yet as recognizing that a sad calamity had befallen them.

Ver. 7. **Ye shall not go out**—*viz.:* for the purpose of accompanying the remains of the slain priests to their grave, and in any way ceasing from their sacred functions on their account. A like command is made of perpetual obligation upon the high-priest in xxi. 12. The reason is given—**for the anointing oil of the LORD is upon you**; consecrated wholly to His service, they might not turn aside from it for any purpose. Comp. Matt. viii. 22.

Ver. 8. **Spake unto Aaron.**—Either through Moses (see Textual note 6); or else Aaron, being now fully constituted high-priest, and having shown his submission in what had just occurred, was made directly the recipient of a Divine communication concerning the duties of the priests.

Vers. 9–11. **Strong drink.**—Heb. שֵׁכָר used apparently in Num. xxviii. 7 as a synonym for wine, but generally taken for an intoxicating drink prepared from grain or honey, or especially from palms. The prohibition of wine and strong drink to the priests is only in connection with their service in the tabernacle. For the present this must have amounted to an almost absolute prohibition, as the service of Aaron and his two sons could have been little less than continuous; but as the priesthood multiplied, of course the time of service for each of them was reduced. The connection of this precept with what goes before and what follows seems almost necessarily to imply that it was called forth by some violation of it on the part of Nadab and Abihu. This supposition, Lange says, "is made probable by the otherwise unexplained command here given, and thus indeed the outward strange fire was only the symbol of the inner strange fire of wine-produced enthusiasm, which so often can mingle itself in pious and animated speeches and poems, by which indeed holy and unholy things are confused." The object of the command is expressed in vers. 10, 11: that the mind of the priests might be clear in the exercise of their own duties, and in the instruction of the people in regard to theirs.

Vers. 12–15. **The oblation that remaineth** from the sacrifices of the day mentioned in ix. 17. **Eat it in a holy place**—as has been so often before commanded in regard to those things which might be eaten only by the priests—not in the sanctuary, but in a place provided for the purpose in the court—LXX.: ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ. After this followed the holy meal upon the priests' portion of the peace offerings (vers. 14, 15), eaten with their families without the court, in any clean place.

Vers. 16–18. **The goat of the sin offering** had indeed been offered for the whole congregation (ix. 3), but its blood had not been brought within the sanctuary. Under these circumstances Moses emphatically declares, and Aaron tacitly acknowledges, that its flesh should, under ordinary circumstances, have been eaten by the priests, instead of being burned. Origen characterizes it as being in consequence an imperfect sacrifice. This shows distinctly that the law for the burning of the sin offering for the whole congregation (iv. 19, 12) turned upon the treatment of the blood, as Moses shows in ver. 18, and not upon the fact that it was offered for all the people. It is said that Moses **was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar**, while Aaron is not mentioned; doubtless because the fault was with them as the ordinary priests, to whom this duty belonged, and not to the high-priest. Lange: "Eleazar and Ithamar also, the two remaining sons of Aaron, have apparently made an error in form; that is, they ought to have eaten this flesh of the goat of the sin offering (not their own, but that of the people) in a holy place as being a most holy thing. This they had neglected; still more, they had burnt the goat. But if they would thus treat the sin goat of the people, as if the ritual for the sin offering of bullocks was to be applied, they ought also to have brought its blood into the sanctuary; but they had not done this, and thus had violated the ritual in two ways" [*i. e.*, in one or other of the two ways; but as they had treated the blood exactly as they were commanded, their fault consisted only in the wrong treatment of the flesh]. "In other words: since the blood had been poured out at the altar in the court, they must also in consequence eat the flesh of the sin offering, since it was given them as a right from Jehovah, as a recompense because they had as priests to bear the misdeeds of the congregation, and to make atonement before Jehovah. But at this reproach of Moses, Aaron knew how to excuse himself and his sons. In the first place, his sons had done their duty in regard to their own sin and burnt offering. In the second place, this fearful accident had happened to him and them, and made them incapable of eating. He appeals to feeling: would it please Jehovah if he should eat in such a frame of mind? This time Aaron has conquered Moses. The first violation of the law proceeded from gross disrespect of the law in carnal conduct; this second violation proceeded from a righteous spiritual elevation above the letter which even Moses must allow."

Ver. 17. **To bear the iniquity of the congregation.**—This expression, however difficult it may be to define the exact limits of its meaning, certainly makes two points clear: first, that the eating of the flesh of the ordinary sin offering by the priests was an essential part of its ritual; and second, that the priests, in receiving the sacrifice and undertaking to make expiation for sins, did act in a mediatorial capacity. "The very eating of the people's sin offering argued the sins of the people were in some sort laid upon the priests, to be taken away by them." Patrick. This eating, however, does not constitute with the sprinkling of the blood "a double atonement," to which Lange rightly objects; but is simply a lesser part of the one atonement of which the blood was the more essential portion. The office of the priests, receiving the victim at the people's hands, was with it to make an atonement or "covering" for the people's sins. Having undertaken this, the responsibility for those sins in a certain sense rested upon them; they must **bear the iniquity of the congregation.**—This was only possible to do by a strict observance of the Divine appointment, since the sacrifice could have no inherent efficacy. They must both sprinkle the blood and eat the flesh. Without the latter, "the sacrifice was imperfect and the sin remained." Origen.

Ver. 19. In Aaron's excuse that "spiritual elevation above the letter" which Lange has noted becomes very plain. It is striking to find this not only in the law, but in regard to the very centre of the law, the sin sacrifice, and that, too, in the very first moment of its institution. On Aaron's unfitness now to eat this offering comp. Hos. ix. 4.

Ver. 20. **He was content.**—"Moses admitted Aaron's plea, but it is not stated whether he

was conscious that he had himself spoken hastily and now conceded the point at issue (as we find him doing on another occasion in reference to the settlement of the two tribes and a half, Num. xxxii. 6), allowing that the priests had done what was in itself right, as S. Augustin, the later Targums, Kurtz, and others, interpret the passage; or whether he yielded out of sympathy with Aaron's natural feelings. The latter alternative is perhaps the more probable one." Clark. But neither alternative is necessary. Both here and in the case cited from Numbers (parallel to which also is Josh. xxii. 10–31) Moses remonstrated against an apparent disregard of the command of God; he was appeased when assured that no disregard was intended, and that in this case the act was exceptional under entirely exceptional circumstances.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. Self-chosen service (ἐθελοθρησκεία, Col. ii. 23) is displeasing to God, as a substitution of what He has not commanded for what He has commanded. It is of the nature of rebellion and is so regarded by Him. "The symbolical meaning of this history is very deep and comprehensive. Every gift to God, every sacrifice for Him, every act of zeal in His service, however it might otherwise outwardly be right, is displeasing to the Lord so soon as the fire of self-denial ceases to originate from the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. xiii. 3." O. von Gerlach.

II. Nadab and Abihu were honored with being "brought near" to God, and were the appointed persons to burn incense in the proper way. They perverted their office and abused their privilege, and they perished. So generally God's gifts perverted work harm to him who perverts them, and this harm is intensified in proportion to the greatness of the gift, 2 Cor. ii. 16.

III. Hence comes the general principle that religious responsibility is proportioned to religious privilege (ver. 3)—a principle often insisted upon in our Lord's teaching.

IV. Under the old covenant, death, as the fruit of sin, brought defilement by its touch. Even father and brothers might not touch the dead bodies of the fallen, lest they should be defiled. Under the new covenant, sin has been conquered by Him who knew no sin, and death by Him who rose from the grave. "No longer, therefore, under the Gospel, is death an unclean thing. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord," Rev. xiv. 13. The Levitical law, by its treatment of death and burial, shows us our condition by nature in contrast with the blessings given by Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life." Wordsworth.

V. It was required of the Levitical priests that in their service in the sanctuary they should drink neither wine nor strong drink. Similarly St. Paul provides (1 Tim. iii. 2, 8) that the Christian ministry must be "not given to wine," and when requiring it for his infirmities, should use it moderately (*ib.* v. 23). Theodoret. The service of God must be "a reasonable service," with faculties unimpaired, and not disturbed by artificial stimulants.

VI. When the priests are said (ver. 17) to **bear the iniquity of the congregation**, the temporary and typical character of the Levitical system is at once manifest. It was plainly impossible for men, who yet had to offer sacrifices for their own sins, to bear the sins of others, and so present them as holy before God, except as they represented something else, *viz.*: the great High Priest who should atone for the sin of the world.

VII. The burning, instead of eating, the flesh of the sin offering, finally acquiesced in by Moses, is instructive doctrinally as showing even in the most rigid part of the Levitical law, "a certain freedom in the arrangement of the minor details, while the substance of the rules is kept inviolate. It is one of the examples we occasionally meet of a distinction being judiciously and honestly made between the letter and the spirit of a law." Murphy. Under the Old Testament as under the New, God desires "mercy and not sacrifice" (Hos. vi. 6; Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7).

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

In this chapter, instead of the expected festivities consequent upon the inauguration of the new priesthood, we find a fearful judgment; so the sin of man ever comes in to mar the good work of God and turn to wormwood His cup of blessing. By this fearful example all will-worship is shown to be displeasing—all attempt to serve God in opposition to the ways of His appointment. "They also offer a strange fire, who offer any thing of their own to God without truly and humbly acknowledging that they have received all from God." Estius. "When we bring zeal without knowledge, misconceits of faith, carnal affections, the devices of our will-worship, superstitious devotions into God's service, we bring common fire to His altar. These flames were never of His kindling; He hates both altar, fire, priest, and sacrifice." Bp. Hall.

The greatness of the punishment was in proportion to the appointed nearness to God of those who had offended. Privilege always brings responsibility. The judgment on Chorazin and Bethsaida must be heavier than upon Sodom and Gomorrha. Compare Heb. ii. 3; xii. 25.

God may use the same means for showing His love and His anger. He consumed the sacrifice by fire; He slew Nadab and Abihu by fire. The result to us of His action depends on our attitude towards Him. The same Gospel is a "savor of life unto life" and of "death unto death." Again: He often uses for man's punishment the very instrument of man's sin; these men sinned by fire and perished by fire; so also the companions of Korah, Num. xvi. 35. So under the laws of His Providence are men's passions made the means of punishing them, and often the objects of unlawful ambition or desire, when attained, become the very scourges of those who sought them.

Aaron held his peace, as the righteous must needs do before the judgments of God, however distressing. See Job i. 22; Ps. xxxix. 9. There can be no hope and no comfort in the world if we may rightfully murmur at the doings of "the Judge of all the earth."

The touch of the dead communicated defilement, but the touch of the Giver of life caused him who was borne out upon the bier to arise (Luke vii. 14), and the damsel who slept in death to arise and walk (Mark v. 42). Wordsworth. Thus does the Antitype excel the type.

Aaron and his surviving sons might not leave the sanctuary to mourn those who had fallen, but all Israel might bewail them; so is the immediate service of God more pressing than all else; what may be right at another time, or to other persons, must be foregone by those who have a duty to God with which it interferes. His service is the prime object to which all other things must conform themselves.

The priests' fervor is not to come of wine or strong drink. In the service of God they who draw near to Him have need of all the calmness and clearness of their minds, lest they do Him dishonor while they profess to serve Him. The excitement of worship, which comes of the abuse of His gifts, though showing itself in eloquence or in more than natural zeal, is not pleasing to Him.

From the fault of the priests in not eating the flesh of the sin offering, Theodoret thus reasons of the duty of the Christian minister: "Hence we learn that we who eat of those things which are offered by the people, and do not live according to the law, nor diligently pray to God for them, will bring down punishment from God;" and Origen says that it behooves the priest first to make himself acceptable to God before he presumes to seek from Him acceptance for the people.

PART THIRD. THE LAWS OF PURITY.

CHAPTERS XI.—XV.

"*The Preliminary Conditions of Sacrifice: the Typical Cleanness and Purifying.*"—LANGE.

PRELIMINARY NOTE ON CLEAN AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS—AND ON DEFILEMENT BY CONTACT.

There has been no little debate as to the origin and ground of the distinction between clean and unclean animals. Such a question can only be settled historically. In Gen. vii. 2 Noah is directed to take into the ark "of every clean beast by sevens, the male and his female," while "of beasts that are not clean by two, the male and his female." There was then already a recognized distinction, and this distinction had nothing to do with the use of animal food, since this had not yet been allowed to man. After the flood, when animal food was given to man (Gen. ix. 3), it was given without limitation. "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things." It may therefore be confidently affirmed that this distinction did not have its origin and ground in the suitableness or unsuitableness of different kinds of animal food, as has been contended by many. Neither could it possibly have been founded in any considerations peculiar to the chosen people, since it is here found existing so many ages before the call of Abraham. Immediately after the flood, however, we have a practical application of the distinction which seems to mark its object with sufficient plainness: "Noah builded an altar unto the LORD; and took of every clean beast, and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar" (Gen. viii. 20). The original distinction must therefore be held to have been between animals fit and unfit for sacrifice (comp. Calvin in Lev. xi. 1). On what ground the selection was originally made for sacrifice is wholly unknown; but it is altogether probable that the same kind of animals which were "clean" in the time of Noah were included in the list of the clean under the Levitical law. Many of the latter, however, were not allowable for sacrifice under the same law, nor is it likely that they ever were; on the other hand, all were admissible for food in Noah's time, while under the Levitical law many are forbidden. While, therefore, the original distinction must be sought in sacrificial use, it is plain that the details of this distinction are largely modified under the Levitical law prescribing the animals that may be allowed for food.

When inquiry is now made as to the grounds of this modification, the only reason given in the law itself is comprehensive (Lev. xi. 43-47; xx. 24-26; Deut. xiv. 21): "For I am the LORD your God; ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy." "I am the

LORD your God, which have separated you from other people." This points plainly to the separation of the Israelites by their prescribed laws of food from other nations; and it is indisputable that the effect of these laws was to place almost insurmountable impediments in the way of familiar social intercourse between the Israelites and the surrounding heathen. When this separation was to be broken down in the Christian Church, an intimation to that effect could not be more effectively conveyed than by the vision of St. Peter of a sheet let down "wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air," with the command, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat" (Acts x. 13). The effectiveness of the separation, however, is to be sought in the details, not in the general character of the distinction, as it is now well known that the ordinary diet of the Egyptians and other nations of antiquity was substantially the same with that of the Israelites. Various reasons given by the fathers and others, with replies showing their fallacy, may be found in Spencer, *de leg. Hebr.* I. c. vii., § 1, what he considers the true reasons (seven in number) being given in the following section. Comp. also Calvin in Lev. xi. 1.

It is to be observed that the distinction of clean and unclean animals has place only at their death. All living animals were alike clean, and the Hebrew had no scruple in handling the living ass or even the dog. The lion and the eagle, too, as has been well observed by Clark, were used in the most exalted symbolism of prophetic imagery. But as soon as the animals were dead, a question as to their cleanness arose; this depended on two points: *a*) the manner of the animal's death; and *b*) the nature of the animal itself. All animals whatever which died of themselves were unclean to the Israelites, although they might be given or sold to "strangers" (Deut. xiv. 21), and the touch of their carcasses communicated defilement (Lev. xi. 39, 40). This then was one broad distinction of the law, and was evidently based upon the fact that from such animals the blood had not been withdrawn.

But a difference is further made between animals, even when properly slaughtered. In a very general way, the animals allowed are such as have been generally recognized among all nations and in all ages as most suitably forming the staple of animal food; yet the law cannot be considered as founded upon hygienic or any other principles of universal application, since no such distinction was recognized in the grant to Noah. Moreover, the obligation of its observance was expressly declared to have been abrogated by the council at Jerusalem, Acts xv. The distinction was therefore temporary, and peculiar to the chosen people. Its main object, as already shown, was to keep them a separate people, and it is invested with the solemnity of a religious observance. In providing regulations for this purpose, other objects were doubtless incidentally regarded, such as laws of health, *etc.*, some of which are apparent upon the surface, while others lie hidden in our ignorance of local customs and circumstances.

Before closing this note it is worthy of remark that the dualistic notions which formed the basis of the distinction between clean and unclean animals among the Persians were absolutely contradicted by the theology of the Israelites. Those animals were clean among the Parsees which were believed to have been created by Ormuzd, while those which proceeded from the evil principle, Ahriman, were unclean. The Hebrews, on the contrary, were most emphatically taught to refer the origin of all things to Jehovah, and however absolute might be the distinction among animals, it was yet a distinction between the various works of the one Creator.

The general principles of determination of clean animals were the same among the Israelites as among other ancient nations; in quadrupeds, the formation of the foot and the method of mastication and digestion; among birds, the rejection as unclean of birds of prey; and among fish, the obvious possession of fins and scales. All these marks of distinction in the Levitical law are wisely and even necessarily made on the basis of popular observation and belief, not on that of anatomical exactness. Otherwise the people would have been continually liable to error. Scientifically, the camel would be said to divide the hoof, and the hare does not chew the cud. But laws for popular use must necessarily employ terms as they are popularly understood. These matters are often referred to as scientific errors; whereas they were simply descriptions, necessarily popular, for the understanding and enforcement of the law.

Defilement by contact comes forward very prominently in this chapter, as it is also frequently mentioned elsewhere. It is not strange that in a law whose educational purpose is everywhere so plain, this most effective symbolism should hold a place, and the contaminating effect of converse with evil be thus impressed upon this people in their spiritual infancy. It thus has its part with all other precepts of ceremonial cleanness in working out the great spiritual purposes of the law. But beyond this, there is here involved the great truth, but imperfectly revealed under the old dispensation, that the body, as well as the soul, has its part in the relations between God and man. The body, as well as the soul, was a sufferer by the primeval sentence upon sin, and the body, as well as the soul, has part in the redemption of Christ, and awaits the resurrection of the just. The ascetic notions of the mediæval ages regarded the body as evil in a sense entirely incompatible with the representations of Scripture. For not merely is the body the handmaid of the soul, and the necessary instrument of the soul's action, but the service of the body as well as the soul is recognized in the New Testament (*e. g.*, Rom. xii. 1) as a Christian duty. On its negative side, at least, this truth was taught under the old dispensation by the many laws of bodily purity, the series of which begins in this chapter. The laws of impurity from physical contact stand as an appendix to the laws of food and as an introduction to the other laws of purity, and form the connecting link between them.

FIRST SECTION.

Laws of Clean and Unclean Food.

"*The Cleanness of the Sacrifice—or the Contrast of the Clean and Unclean Animals.*"—LANGE.

CHAP. XI. 1–47.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying unto them, Speak unto
the children of Israel, saying, These *are* the beasts [animals[1]] which ye shall eat
3 among all the beasts that *are* on the earth. Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is
cloven footed [and completely separates the hoof[2]], *and* cheweth the cud, among
4 the beasts, that shall ye eat. Nevertheless these shall ye not eat of them that
chew the cud, or of them that divide the hoof: *as* the camel, because he cheweth
5 the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he *is* unclean unto you. And the coney,[3] be-
cause he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he *is* unclean unto you.
6 And the hare, because he cheweth the cud, but divideth not the hoof; he *is* unclean
7 unto you. And the swine, though he divide the hoof, and be cloven footed [and
completely separates the hoof[4]], yet he cheweth not the cud; he *is* unclean to you.
8 Of their flesh shall ye not eat, and their carcase shall ye not touch; they *are* un-
clean to you.
9 [5]These shall ye eat of all that *are* in the waters: whatsoever hath fins and scales
10 in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers, them shall ye eat. And all that have
not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in the waters,
and of any living thing which *is* in the waters, they *shall be* an abomination unto
11 you: they shall be even an abomination unto you; ye shall not eat of their flesh,
12 but ye shall have their carcases in abomination. [6]Whatsoever hath no fins nor
scales in the waters, that *shall be* an abomination unto you.
13 And these *are they which* ye shall have in abomination among the fowls; they
shall not be eaten, they *are* an abomination: the eagle,[7] and the ossifrage,[8] and the

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. חַיָּה is a different word from בְּהֵמָה in the following clause, and the difference should be recognized in the translation, as it is in the Semitic versions. The former is the more general term, the latter (comp. Gen. i. 24) refers to the quadrupeds included in this section (vers. 1–8) in contradistinction from birds and reptiles.

[2] Ver. 3. וּשְׁסַעַת שֶׁסַע פְּרָסֹת. The idea is that of not merely partially (like the camel), but completely dividing the hoof. The Sam., LXX., Syr. and nine MSS. make this still more indefinite by inserting שְׁתֵּי=*two* before the last word.

[3] Ver. 5. הַשָּׁפָן. The animal is indicated here as one that chews the cud (or appears to do so), in Ps. civ. 18; Prov. xxx. 26, as living in the rocks, and in the latter as being very weak. It occurs elsewhere only in the parallel place, Deut. xiv. 7. Here the LXX. renders it δασύπους, Aq. λαγωός; in Deut. xiv. 7, the LXX. has χοιρογρύλλιος=*bristly animal*, which is adopted by the Vulg. in both places. The Sam. translates it *Vabr*, the *Hyrax Syriacus*, which is said to be still called *tsofun* in Southern Arabia. Fürst says: "The Targ. points to the same animal when it translates טַלְוָא, טַפְּסָא, טַפְזָא (*leaper*) since the *Vabr* goes by leaps." The Duke of Argyle (Reign of Law, p. 264) speaks of a specimen of it in the Zoological Gardens, and states that in the structure of the teeth and the foot it is assimilated to the rhinoceros. Cuvier classed it with the pachyderms. The Rabbins understood it to be a rabbit, and were followed by Luther and the A. V. in the old word *Coney*. Bochart (Hieroz. Lib. III., c. 33) understands it of the *Jerboa* or *bear-mouse*, and so Gesenius, Geddes and others. Although the word in the A. V. is certainly wrong, yet as it is obsolete, it seems unnecessary to make a change which could only be either to the Heb. word, or to the scientific name.

[4] Ver. 7. The construction is the same as in ver. 3. See note [2].

[5] Ver. 9. The Sam., one MS., the LXX. and Syr. prefix the conjunction וְ.

[6] Ver. 12. The same, with fourteen MSS., here prefix the conjunction.

[7] Ver. 13. נֶשֶׁר is uniformly translated *eagle* in the A. V., ἀετός in the LXX., and *aquila* in the Vulg. Kalisch says this "is beyond a doubt." The same meaning is given by Fürst and Gesenius, although both would include also the sense of *vulture*. Clark's proposed emendation, *the great vulture*, seems therefore unnecessary.

[8] Ver. 13. עָזְנִיָּה פֶּרֶס. Both, by preponderance of authority, species of eagles, and the former sufficiently well described by *ossifrage*; the latter species is not certainly identified, the word occurring only here and in the parallel, Deut. xiv. 12. The LXX. renders ἁλιαίετος=*sea eagle*. Fürst prefers *Valeria*, the black eagle. Kalisch prefers the sense *vulture*. Gesen. (Thesaur.), *black eagle*.

14, 15 ospray,[8] and the vulture,[9] and the kite[10] after his kind; [11]every raven after his
16 kind; and the owl [ostrich[12]], and the night hawk [owl[13]], and the cuckow [gull[14]],
17 and the hawk after his kind, and the little owl,[15] and the cormorant, and the great
18, 19 owl,[16] and the swan,[17] and the pelican, and the gier eagle [vulture[18]], and the
stork,[19] the[20] heron[21] after her kind, and the lapwing [hoopoe[22]], and the bat.
20 All[11] fowls that creep [all winged creeping things[23]], going upon *all* four, *shall be*
21 an abomination unto you. Yet these may ye eat of every flying creeping thing
that goeth upon *all* four, which have[24] legs above their feet, to leap withal[25] upon
22 the earth; *even* these of them ye may eat; the locust after his kind, and the bald
locust[26] after his kind, and the beetle[26] after his kind, and the grasshopper after his
23 kind. But all *other* flying creeping things, which have four feet, *shall be* an abo-

[8] Ver. 14. רָאָה, a word, ἅπ. λεγ. In the parallel passage, Deut. xiv. 13, it is רְאָה. Its etymology indicates a ravenous bird of swift flight. LXX. γύψ=*vulture*, Vulg. *milvus*=*kite*. Bochart considers it a species of hawk or falcon. So Kalisch. In Deut. xiv. 13 there is mentioned also דָּיָה, making twenty-one varieties of birds; but that word in Deut. is omitted by the Sam. and four MSS.

[9] Ver. 14. אַיָּה is only to be identified by the fact that it here stands for the name of a class—*after his kind*, and that in Job xxviii. 7 it is spoken of for its great keenness of sight. The LXX. renders here *kite*, in Deut. and Job *vulture*. Clark makes it *milvus regalis*.

[10] Ver. 15 and ver. 20. The Sam., many MSS. and versions prefix the conjunction.

[11] Ver. 16. בַּת הַיַּעֲנָה. LXX. στρουθός. The word is uniformly rendered *owl* in the text of the A. V.; but in the marg. of Job xxx. 29; Isa. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 13; xliii. 20, it is rendered *ostrich* in accordance with the Targ., LXX., Vulg. and Syr., and there can be no doubt that this is the true sense. The fem. stands for the bird collectively, of both sexes. Rosen.: "Vox, בַּת, apposita est ex more quodam Orientalium, qui nomina *pater*, *mater*, *filius*, *filia*, animalium quorundam nominibus præfigere solent sine respectu ætatis et sexus." Bochart, however, thinks it means distinctively the female.

[12] Ver. 16. תַּחְמָס (from חָמַס, *to do violence*), interpreted by Bochart, and others on his authority, of the male ostrich; but this is now generally rejected. The Targ. Onk. has צִיצָא, and Targ. Jerus. חַטְפִּיתָא=*swallow*. Others (Knobel) consider it the *cuckoo*; but the rendering of the LXX. and Vulg., *owl*, is now adopted more generally than any other.

[13] Ver. 16. שַׁחַף occurs only here and in Deut. xiv. 15. Knobel understands it of a species of hawk trained in Syria for hunting gazelles, *etc.*; but most other interpreters understand it of a sea bird, whether the *stormy petrel* (Bochart) or more generally the *sea gull* after the Vulg. and LXX. λάρος.

[14] Ver. 17. כּוֹס. There seems no sufficient reason to question the accuracy of the A. V., which is substantially that of the ancient versions. Tristram identifies it with the *Athene meridionalis* common in Syria. Bochart, however, would render *Pelican*, and Riggs *Night-hawk*.

[15] Ver. 17. The A. V. is probably right. The LXX., Vulg. and Targ. Onk. have *Ibis*, which seems to have arisen from a misplacement of the words of the text, rather than from a different translation of יַנְשׁוּף. They are followed by Riggs and others.

[16] Ver. 18. תִּנְשֶׁמֶת. The same word is used, ver. 30, for *mole* (probably chameleon): here it refers to a bird, and it is likely that this is the word for which *Ibis* stands in the LXX. and Vulg. But it is not probable that the Israelites would have come much in contact with the Ibis. The preponderance of authority (see Fürst) is for some variety of owl, according to the Chald., Syr. and Sam.; but there does not appear to be sufficient certainty to warrant a change in the text of the A. V.

[17] Ver. 18. רָחָם. LXX. rendering doubtful. The best authorities agree that some species of *vulture* is meant. Gesenius (thesaur.) would make it a very small species, of the size of a crow. Others consider it most probably the large Egyptian vulture, *Neophron percnopterus*. Perhaps something of this kind was meant by *gier eagle*. Kalisch, governed only by the order of the birds, would translate *pelican*.

[18] Ver. 19. חֲסִידָה, LXX., Aq., Symm., Theod., *heron*, but LXX. in Job xxxix. 13 *stork*. Either bird answers well enough to the etymology and to the passages when it occurs, and *stork* is as likely to be right as *heron*.

[19] Ver. 19. The Sam. and sixteen MSS. prefix the conjunction which is found in the parallel place in Deut. For the want of it Knobel would connect the word with the preceding as an adjective; but it seems better to consider it as an accidental omission.

[20] Ver. 19. אֲנָפָה. The meaning of the rendering in Targ. Onk. is unknown, Syr. retains the Heb. word, LXX. χαραδριός, a bird chiefly remarkable for its greediness. The Heb. etymology is uncertain. Clark identifies it with the *great plover* (*Charadrius œdicnemus*). Fürst defines it *Parrot*, and so Gesen. Bochart, following the etymology of the Rabbins, defines it *the angry bird*, and considers it some species of eagle. It seems probable that the A. V. is wrong, but difficult to determine upon a substitute.

[21] Ver. 19. הַדְּבֶשֶׁת. The bird intended has not been certainly identified; but the authority of the LXX., ἔποπα, and Vulg., *upupa*, is here followed. The Arab. adopts it, and it is followed by Riggs. Bochart would render *mountain cock* after the Chald.

[22] Ver. 20. כָּל שֶׁרֶץ הָעוֹף. The idea of *fowls that creep* is not less strange and grotesque in Heb. than in English. The word שֶׁרֶץ by its etymology means those creatures that multiply abundantly, swarm, whence it came to be applied to very much the same creatures as we mean by vermin. It can hardly be better expressed than by *creeping things*. **Going upon all four** does not necessarily mean having just four feet, but going with the body in a horizontal position.

[23] Ver. 21. For the לֹא of the text the *k'ri* has לוֹ, and so the Sam. and many MSS. So it must necessarily be understood, as it is in the versions.

[24] Ver. 21. For בַּהֵן the Sam. and thirty-seven MSS. have בָּהֶם.

[25] Ver. 22. Beetle is certainly wrong; for this, like the rest, must have been one of the leaping insects. There are no means of identifying these four varieties. Each of them stands for a class "after his kind." Two of them, the כְּלָיְעָם and the חַרְגֹּל, do not occur elsewhere. The others are of frequent occurrence, and are uniformly translated in the A. V. the first *locust*, the last *grasshopper*. It would probably be better in the other cases to follow the example of the older English and most modern versions in giving simply the Hebrew names without attempting translation.

24 mination unto you. And for these ye shall be unclean: whosoever toucheth the
25 carcase of them shall be unclean until the even. And whosoever beareth *ought* of
the carcase of them shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even.
26 *The carcases* of every beast which divideth the hoof, and *is* not cloven footed,
nor cheweth the cud, *are* unclean unto you: every one that toucheth them[27] shall be
27 unclean. And whatsoever goeth upon his paws, among all manner of beasts[27a] that
go on *all* four, those *are* unclean unto you: whoso toucheth their carcase shall be
28 unclean until the even. And he that beareth the carcase of them shall wash his
clothes, and be unclean until the even: they *are* unclean unto you.
29 These also *shall be* unclean unto you among the creeping things that creep upon
the earth; the weasel,[28] and the mouse, and the tortoise [the great lizard[29]] after
30 his kind, and the ferret [gecko[30]], and the chameleon [strong lizard[31]], and the
lizard [climbing lizard[32]], and the snail [lizard[33]], and the mole [chameleon[34]].
31 These *are* unclean to you among all that creep: whosoever doth touch them, when
32 they be dead, shall be unclean until the even. And upon whatsoever *any* of them,
when they are dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether *it be* any vessel [thing[35]]
of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel [thing[35]] *it be*, wherein
[wherewith[35]] *any* work is done, it must be put into water, and it shall be unclean
33 until the even; so it shall be cleansed. And every earthen vessel, whereinto *any*
34 of them falleth, whatsoever *is* in it shall be unclean; and ye shall break it. Of
all meat [food[36]] which may be eaten, *that* on which *such* [*om. such*[37]] water cometh
shall be unclean: and all drink that may be drunk in every *such* vessel shall be
35 unclean. And every *thing* whereupon *any part* of their carcase falleth shall be
unclean; *whether it be* oven, or ranges[38] for pots, they shall be broken down: *for*
36 they *are* unclean, and shall be unclean unto you. Nevertheless a fountain[39] or pit,
wherein there is plenty of water, shall be clean: but that which[40] toucheth their

[27] Ver. 26. Six MSS. and the LXX. specify, what is sufficiently plain, *their carcases*. [27a] Ver. 27. See note [1] on ver. 2.

[28] Ver. 29. חֹלֶד occurs nowhere else. The A. V. seems justified in following the LXX. and Targ., although Bochart would render *mole*, which is still called *Chuld* by the Arabs.

[29] Ver. 29. צָב, a word in this sense, ἁπ. λέγ. There seems no doubt that this and all the names following in ver. 30 indicate various species of lizard. So Riggs. This particular one is called by the LXX. ὁ κροκόδυλος ὁ χερσαῖος=*land crocodile*, and so St. Jerome. Bochart considers it a kind of large lizard abounding in Syria, often two feet long. Tristam identifies it with the *uromastix spinipes*. The translation proposed by Clark, *the great lizard*, is probably as good as can be had.

[30] Ver. 30. אַנָקָה in this sense only here. LXX. μυγάλη=*shrew mouse;* Onk. יְלִי=*hedge hog;* the other oriental versions by various names of lizard. Almost all the authorities concur in making it some variety of lizard. Knobel is certainly wrong in identifying it with the *Lacerta Nilotica*, an animal four feet long. Fürst only so far defines it as "a reptile with a long narrow neck." The translation of Rosenmüller, *lacerta gecko*, seems as probable as any.

[31] Ver. 30. כַּח, a word of frequent occurrence for *strength, power*, but as a name of an animal occurring only here. The etymology seems to indicate a characteristic of strength (although Furst makes it *the slimy*), and the connection, some variety of lizard. The translation *chameleon* is derived from the LXX., and is probably wrong. Keil shows that Knobel (followed by Clark) is in error in translating by *frog*. The uncertainty is too great to substitute another word for that of the A. V., which yet must be changed, because the last name belongs to the chameleon. The etymology simply is therefore indicated.

[32] Ver. 30. לְטָאָה, another word, ἁπ. λέγ. LXX. καλαβώτης, Vulg. *stellio*. Knobel makes it a crawling, and Fuerst a climbing lizard. The latter is adopted as a probable sense in order to avoid confusion in the text.

[33] Ver. 30. חֹמֶט, also ἁπ. λέγ. LXX. σαῦρα, Vulg. *lacerta*, and so also the Syr. The A. V. comes from the Targ. Jerus. and Rabbinical authorities. Otherwise there is a general agreement with Bochart that it should be rendered *lizard*.

[34] Ver. 30. תִּנְשֶׁמֶת has already occurred, ver. 18, as the name of a bird. Here it is some variety of lizard, and from its etymology—נָשַׁם, *to breathe, to draw in air*—there is a good degree of unanimity in understanding it of the chameleon, either as inflating itself, or as popularly supposed to live on air.

[35] Ver. 32. כְּלִי is evidently here used, as in Ex. xxii. 6 (7), in its most comprehensive sense. It is only limited by the clause **wherewith any work is done.** This change of course makes it necessary to translate בָּהֶם, *wherewith*, instead of *wherein*.

[36] Ver. 34. אֹכֶל means any kind of food, especially cereal. The English *meat* is now so altered in sense that it is better to change it.

[37] Ver. 34. The word *such* is unfortunately inserted in the A. V. The idea is (comp. ver. 38) that all meat prepared with water should be rendered unclean by the falling of any of these animals upon it.

[38] Ver. 35. כִּירַיִם occurs only here, and there is much question as to its meaning. According to Keil it "can only signify, when used in the dual, a vessel consisting of two parts, *i. e.* a pan or pot *with a lid*." So Knobel and the Targums; others a support for the pot like a pair of bricks, LXX. χυτρόπους; others, as Fürst, "*a cooking furnace*, probably consisting of two ranges of stones which met together in a sharp angle."

[39] Ver. 36. The Sam. and LXX. add *of waters*.

[40] Ver. 36. Rosenmüller, Keil, and others understand this in the masculine, *he who, viz.* in removing the carcase. The meaning, however, seems to be more general: the person or the thing touching the carcase, in removing it or otherwise.

37 carcase shall be unclean. And if *any part* of their carcase fall upon any[41] sowing
38 seed which is to be sown, it *shall be* clean. But if *any* water be put upon the seed,
and *any part* of their carcase fall thereon, it *shall be* unclean unto you.

39 And if any beast, of which ye may eat, die; he that toucheth the carcase there-
40 of[42] shall be unclean until the even. And he that eateth of the carcase of it[42] shall
wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even: he also that beareth the carcase
of it[42] shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even.

41 And every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth *shall be* an abomination;
42 it shall not be eaten. Whatsoever goeth upon the belly,[43] and whatsoever goeth
upon *all* four, or whatsoever hath more feet among all creeping things that creep
43 upon the earth, them ye shall not eat; for they *are* an abomination. Ye shall not
make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall
44 ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby. For I
am the LORD your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be
holy; for I *am* holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creep-
45 ing thing that creepeth upon the earth. For I *am* the LORD[44] that bringeth you
up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; ye shall therefore be holy, for I *am*
holy.

46 This *is* the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living creature
that moveth in the waters, and of every creature that creepeth upon the earth:
47 to make a difference between the unclean and the clean, and between the beast[45]
that may be eaten and the beast[45] that may not be eaten.

[41] Ver. 37. The Sam., two MSS., and Vulg. omit *any;* but two MSS. and the LXX. insert it before *seed* in the following verse.

[42] Vers. 39 and 40. Several MSS. and the LXX. have the plural in these places.

[43] Ver. 42. The letter ו in גְּחוֹן=*belly* is printed in larger type in the Heb. Bibles to indicate that it is the middle letter of the Pentateuch.

[44] Ver. 45. The Sam., two MSS. and the Syr. add, as in ver. 44, *your God.*

[45] Ver. 47. See note on ver. 2.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The whole of Lange's "Exegetical" is here given in full, the remarks of the translator being added in square brackets.

"Cleanness as a condition of the sacrifices—the cleanness of the sacrificial animals, and the cleanness to be regained through the purification of men and of human conditions. Chap. xi.–xv. 'These are regarded in the law as defiling: the use of certain animals, and the touching a carcase (chap. xi.); the confinement of a woman (chap. xii.); the leprosy (chap. xiii., xiv.); the issue of seed of a man (ch. xv. 1–15); the involuntary emission of semen (*ib.* 15, 16); the carnal conjunction of the sexes (*ib.* 18); the menses of a woman (*ib.* 19–24); and the lasting issue of blood of the same (*ib.* 25–30); to which Num. xix. 11–22 adds the touching the dead; but the things mentioned do not all give the same uncleanness,' *etc.* Knobel, p. 432. The priests were to administer the laws of cleanness and of purification, so to speak, as the religious district physicians of the theocracy. On the laws of the Gentiles about cleanness, see Knobel, pp. 436–40; on the animals, pp. 443 ss. (the detailed presentation)."

"Chap. xi. The cleanness of the sacrifice, or the contrast of the clean and unclean animals. The clean sacrificial animal is marked out from the four-footed beasts by two characteristics: cleaving the hoof and chewing the cud. The cloven hoof distinguishes the slow-moving, tame animal, naturally adapted to domestication, from the single-hoofed animal, naturally wild, although sometimes capable of being tamed. The rumination characterizes quiet, dispassionate, graminivorous animals, as opposed to the carnivorous beasts of prey, and the unclean omnivorous beasts."

"Thus especially are the one-hoofed excluded, although they chew the cud; the camel, and (as stated) the rock badger, the hare. And so with those that cleave the hoof and do not chew the cud—the swine. And, of course, the four-footed creatures which lack both characteristics."

"In regard to all unclean animals, the use of their meat and the touching of their carcase is forbidden. That they certainly might not be offered in sacrifice is therewith presupposed. Vers. 1–8."

[From this general view of the chapter, and from several of the particulars, a dissent must be expressed. Although, as has been shown in the preliminary note, the original distinction between clean and unclean animals was in regard to their fitness or unfitness for sacrifice; yet here there is no immediate reference to sacrifice at all, and the animals are classified solely in relation to their being allowed or forbidden for food. Again, in the detail, while among the animals reared by man it may be true that "the cloven hoof distinguishes the slow-moving tame animal;" yet this certainly could not apply to the gazelle and other kinds of deer, which are equally included among the clean animals. Probably Lange's remark was made because his mind was already fixed upon the classification of animals for sacrifice, although even then it would but imperfectly

apply to the goat. Also, on the other side, "the single-hoofed animal, naturally wild, but sometimes capable of being tamed," is quite insufficient in its description, for the single-hoofed horse is quite as much a domestic animal as the bull or the goat, and it fails altogether to include the many-toed domestic cat and dog, which were eminently unclean.

[The first and larger half of this book is concerned with the means of approach to God. First of all came the laws of sacrifice, chaps. i.—vii.; then followed the consecration of the priests by whom the sacrifices were to be offered, with an account of their entrance upon their office, and the connected events, chaps. viii.—x.; now follow the laws of purity, chaps. xi.—xv., and of these first, the laws of clean and unclean food, contained in the present chapter. In this connection also the uncleanness produced by contact with the dead bodies of animals unclean for food is emphatically set forth, and thus this chapter is intimately connected with the laws of purification in the following chapters. "In all the nations and all the religions of antiquity we find the contrast between clean and unclean, which was developed in a dualistic form, it is true, in many of the religious systems, but had its primary root in the corruption that had entered the world through sin. This contrast was limited in the Mosaic law to the animal food of the Israelites, to contact with dead animals and human corpses, and to certain bodily conditions and diseases that are associated with decomposition." **Keil.**

[Vers. 1–8 are concerned with the larger quadrupeds. The distinction is so made among these that the Israelites might be in no mistake about them. To an anatomist it might have been enough to say either **parteth the hoof**, or **cheweth the cud**; but since several animals apparently had one of these characteristics without the other, or were popularly supposed to have them, for the sake of clearness both are given, and also some animals are excluded, as the camel, which apparently lacked one of them, although anatomically it might be considered as possessing both.

[Ver. 1. Both Moses, as the lawgiver, and Aaron, as the now fully consecrated high-priest, to whom would especially pertain the enforcement of the laws of purity, are now addressed together.

[Ver. 3. No enumeration is here made of the animals possessing these qualifications; but there is such an enumeration in the parallel passage, Deut. xiv. 4, 5.

[Ver. 4. The camel has a ball behind the cleft of the foot on which it treads. It comes, therefore, under the class of those with hoofs not completely cloven. So also the swine in ver. 7 is spoken of as dividing the hoof, because he does so in all common acceptation, and is so spoken of at this day, although anatomically he has four toes. Correspondingly in vers. 5, 6 animals are spoken of which appear to the eye to **chew the cud**, although they do not really; because otherwise the people, guided by the appearance, would be led into transgression. All these animals, it is needless to say, were eaten among surrounding people, some by one nation, some by another.—F. G.]

Vers. 9–12. "The clean aquatic animals are distinguished likewise by two characteristics—they must have fins and scales. All aquatic animals, on the other hand, which have not these characteristics, should be not only unclean to them, but an abomination. The fish nature must thus appear distinctly marked. Of fitness for sacrifice, nevertheless, nothing is said here" [obviously because fish were not included among sacrificial animals at all]; "*as food for fast days, fish could not possibly have been used by the Jews.*" [In this, as in the preceding law, the marks of distinction are to be understood of obvious ones: fins and scales that were apparent to the eye. As the law covers **all that are in the waters**, the crustacea, lobsters, crabs, *etc.*, and the mollusks, oysters, *etc.*, are wholly forbidden.—F. G.]

Vers. 13–19. "With reference to birds, the unclean varieties are named at length: eagles, hawks, fish-hawks, vultures, kites, and every thing of that kind, all kinds of ravens, the ostrich, the night-owl, the cuckoo, the kinds of sparrow-hawk, the eared owl, the swan, the horned owl, the bat, the bittern, stork, heron, jay, hoopoe, swallow. The clean kinds are not named; they are limited to a few examples. Pigeons and turtle-doves, however, were more especially made use of for sacrifice." ["Pigeons and turtle-doves" were the only birds used for sacrifice, but they are not mentioned here, because this chapter is not concerned with sacrifice. For the birds intended by this list of twenty Hebrew names, see the Textual notes. All the birds mentioned, so far as they can be identified, feed more or less exclusively upon animal food; but no general characteristic is given. The list is probably only meant to include those prohibited birds with which the Israelites were likely to come in contact. All not included in it, however, would have been lawful under a strict construction of the law. The bat is included in the prohibited list on the general principle of this whole nomenclature; it was popularly regarded as a bird.—F. G.]

Vers. 20–25. "A remarkable exception is made by the varieties of locusts appended to the birds (locusts, crickets, grasshoppers, green grasshoppers). It is as if these animals were to be an important object of game for the theocracy." [It is evident that they did, as in the case of John the Baptist, become an important item of food for the poorer classes, and as they are still in the desert regions adjoining Palestine. — F. G.] "But besides these, all winged (four-footed) insects are described as things to be avoided (not abominable)." [This is a general prohibition of all small flying creatures, having more than two feet. **Creeping things** in the original means also "things that swarm" or multiply in great numbers. **Going upon all four** seems intended, in contrast to birds which have only two feet, to include all that have more than two feet, and consequently creep in a horizontal position. It is so understood by Jewish writers. From this general prohibition the *saltatoria* are excepted, which are still, as they have always been, used as an article of food by the poorer classes in the East. These have, like the common

grasshopper, very long hind legs for leaping. With this exception, this whole class of creatures is described in vers. 23–25 as abominable. Yet the living animal communicated no uncleanness by contact—only its dead body. This is a declaration immediately afterwards (vers. 27, 28) extended also to the bodies of unclean quadrupeds, and also (vers. 39, 40) to the bodies of even clean animals that have died of themselves. Washing of the clothes (vers. 25, 28) required of those who bore their carcases was evidently because contact with the clothes could hardly be avoided in doing this.—F. G.]

Vers. 26–28. "Once more the characteristics are enjoined—to which, however, the definition is added that also all beasts which go on paws (the stealthy-going beasts of prey) are to be considered unclean."

Vers. 29–38. "Moreover there is still a crowd of little animals named in which there is no attempt at a natural history classification, as a resemblance has already appeared in the four-footed flying creatures. Mammalia: mole and mouse; amphibia: the lizard, the Egyptian lizard, the frog, the tortoise, the snail, the chameleon. This division of various animals is more especially prominent because the individuals that compose it could easily make clean objects unclean. First, the dead body of all these creatures is, and makes, unclean; secondly, the water with which one has purified either himself or any object from them; thirdly, utensils, meats and drinks which these creatures" [*i. e.*, their dead bodies] "have touched, vers. 29–35. On the other hand, these animals cannot defile the spring, the cistern, or the seeds intended for sowing. The case is different with seed intended for food when wet with water, vers. 36-38." [The names of these creatures have already been treated in the Textual notes. It appears that, except the first mentioned weasel (or mole) and the mouse, they are all of the lizard family. But in vers. 32-38 the uncleanness produced by contact with their dead bodies is carried much further than in regard to the animals previously named, doubtless for the reason suggested by Lange that there was more likelihood of contact from them. Any thing of which use was made in doing work (ver. 32) must be soaked in water. **Skin** included in the list refers to the skins used for churning, for holding wine and other liquids, and for a variety of purposes. The earthen vessel (ver. 33) into which any of their bodies fell must be broken on the same principle, but with an opposite application, as in vi. 28. The ground in both cases is the absorbent character of unglazed earthenware; there it must be broken lest what it had absorbed of the "most holy offering" should be defiled; here lest the defilement it had itself absorbed should be communicated. In vers. 34 and 38 it is provided that if their carcase fell upon any food or seed in a dry state, it should not communicate defilement; but if these were wet, they should be defiled. The reason of the distinction is evident—the moisture would act as a conveyor of the defilement. In ver. 35 the strong contamination of these dead bodies is still further expressed; but in ver. 36 an exception is made in favor of any large collection of water in fountains or cisterns, on the general principle that God "will have mercy rather than sacrifice."—F. G.]

Vers. 39, 40. "Finally comes into consideration the carcase of the clean animal that has died a natural death. This also makes unclean (*a*) by contact, (*b*) by unconscious using thereof, (*c*) through carrying and throwing it away. The one defiled must wash his clothes and hold himself unclean until evening." [Yet from vii. 24 it is evident that this precept applied to the dead body as a whole, not to the fat, or probably to the skin, when it had been separated. The reason for the uncleanness of the carcase was evidently that its blood had not been poured out, but was still in the veins and arteries, and spread about in the flesh. This would not apply to the separate fat, nor to the skin, when properly cleaned. The provision for purification of one who had eaten of the flesh may apply not only to unconscious eating (Lange), but also to eating in cases of necessity. It did not constitute a *sin*, but only a ceremonial defilement, for which purification was provided.—F. G.]

Vers. 41, 42. "At last the true vermin are spoken of. Every thing that crawls, that goes on the belly (in addition to the division already given), four-footed vermin, and those having more than four feet (beetles)." [It was a curious conceit, adopted from Münster by some of the older writers, that flies and worms living upon fruit and vegetables are not here prohibited because they do not "creep upon the earth." The text evidently intends to forbid **all creeping things**, and is especially comprehensive in ver. 43. The Talmudists also exclude from the operation of the law all the minute creatures supposed by them to be spontaneously generated in vegetables, fruits, cheese, *etc.*, and all the minute parasitic animals. It is plain enough, however, that the law, making its distinctions by obvious and popularly recognized marks, does not enter at all into *minutiæ* of this sort.]

Vers. 43–45. [**Ye shall not make yourselves abominable.**—Lit.] "Ye shall not make your souls an abomination—a strong expression, but the key to this legislation. From the educational standpoint of the law for this morally infant people, purification must be made from all beastly conditions by a strong exclusion of all the lower animal forms, and the people thus be elevated to a consciousness of personal dignity. Therefore it is also further said that this is in conformity with the character of Jehovah your God. **Ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy**—*i. e.*, become sanctified personalities; **for I am holy**—*i. e.*, the absolute sanctified Personality. They could thus, by the defilement of their body, defile also their souls. This also is made prominent: that Jehovah **bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt**, the country defiled by animal worship."

Vers. 46, 47. "**This is the law.**—Although it is not specifically extended over the whole animal kingdom, it is still a general regulating principle according to which the distinctions are to be made. In principle, with this, the distinction is also introduced in regard to the vegetable kingdom, the contrast of edible and inedible plants.

Yet the application of this to the manner of living, to the usages, is left untold."

"In regard to the law of clean animals, we have to distinguish different classes: the specifically clean, or cleanest animals, are those used in sacrifice—old and young cattle, sheep and goats, turtle-doves, and (young) pigeons. These animals form the common food of Jehovah and His people; the symbolical food of Jehovah, and the actual food of the Israelites—a mark of the divine dignity of man, and of his designation as the image of God. Of the vegetables: with this animal centre correspond the cereals, especially barley and wheat, incense, wine, and oil; of the mineral kingdom, salt. The second class is made up of the clean animals which men were allowed to eat, but which were not fitted for sacrifice. The third class is made up of the unclean animals, the touch of which,—so long as they are living,—does not make men unclean, but of which they are not allowed to eat, and whose carcase defiles them, (not the fat of the slain animals). In the fourth class, finally, are the repulsive animals, which even while living are repulsive at least to men, the creeping and crawling animals. That this classification was to be symbolic of spiritual conditions is shown to us very clearly in the vision of Peter in Acts x.; but that the ordinary symbolism is limited by extraordinary symbolical requirements is shown to us by the appearance of the eagle in the forms of the Cherubim. With the New Testament this symbolism generally has reached its end, that is, face to face with Christian knowledge. But yet, conditionally, it remains in the New Testament era proportionately through the Christian national customs, as this can be deduced from the prohibition of the eating of blood, and of things strangled (Acts xv.). The condition of natural abhorrence towards all repulsive objects certainly remains more or less ineradicable, although even in this respect, necessity can break iron."

"We should distinguish here most carefully between the theocratic teleological rules, which have a divine and ideal force, and their exemplification, which belongs to the Jewish *sensus communis*, and its product, popular usage; as is shown here, particularly by the example of the unruminating animals, the badger and hare (which seemed to the people to ruminate to some extent). Obstinacy in valuing the literal inspiration would certainly make here an irreconcilable conflict between theology, or even nominal belief, and natural science, and the hare would become the favorite wild game of negation as Balaam's ass is its favorite charger."

"In regard to the animals mentioned here, we must refer to the detailed treatment of Knobel and Keil, the quoted literature of the latter, and the natural history of Calwer and others."

[It is to be observed that there is no defilement whatever produced by the contact with any living animal. The distinction between animals which are attractive and those which are repulsive to man is not at all recognized; nor indeed, judging from the habits of different nations, would it be easy to draw any line of distinction on this ground. The law simply prescribes what animals shall be, and what shall not be *used for food*—**between the beast that may be eaten and the beast that may not be eaten,** ver. 47. The distinction is nevertheless symbolical, as the line of separation is plainly so taken as to exclude from the list of the clean all *carnivora*, except in the case of fish whose habits are to a great extent hidden under the waves from common observation. But while no living animal defiled, the bodies of all dead animals, not properly slaughtered, did defile. The peculiar care with which defilement is guarded against in the case of the carcasses of certain of the smaller animals (vers. 29-38), seems to be due to the greater liability to contact with them. The degree of uncleanness occasioned by contact with the dead body of any animal which died of itself, was the same in all cases, vers. 25, 28, 31, 40, even in that of animals otherwise fit for food. The only exception is in case of sacrificial or food animals when properly slaughtered, an exception obviously necessary unless sacrifices and animal food were to be prohibited. The Apostle has expressly taught "that there is nothing unclean of itself" (Rom. xiv. 14); and we must look therefore for the ground of the distinctions made in this chapter, not directly to anything in the nature of the various animals themselves, but to the educational object of the law. That educational object, however, was of course best subserved by having regard to such characteristics of the animals as should make the lessons to be taught most impressive and most easily apprehended.—F. G.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The doctrinal significance of the distinction between animals clean and unclean for food, must be considered in view of two facts: first, that as far as food is concerned, this is distinctly a part of that law which was "added because of transgressions." It limited an earlier freedom, and it passed away when the law was superseded by a higher revelation. Secondly, that for the time while the law was in force—the whole period of Israel's national existence—these precepts were elevated into distinctly religious duties, resting upon the holiness which should characterize the people of a holy God (vers. 44, 45). These two facts can only be brought into harmony in view of the educational purpose of the law. The people, in their spiritual infancy, could only be taught purity by sensible symbols, and among these there was nothing which entered more thoroughly into all the arrangements of daily life than the selection of food. By this, therefore, they were taught to keep themselves pure from all defilement which God had forbidden.

II. The evil consequences attending a neglect of the precepts in this chapter are represented in a twofold aspect: First, there was sin in disobedience to these as to any other divine commands, and this is described as making **yourselves abominable,** (ver. 43). This phrase precisely is applied only to the eating of **creeping things,** but is implied in regard to the others (vers. 11, 13, 23). It carries with it the idea that he who offended in these matters put himself in that relation towards God in which

these things intended to stand towards man:—he had sinned by transgression, and thus made himself an abomination. The other aspect is that of the violation of the theocratic order, and here the penalty is very light. The kind of uncleanness contracted in any of these instances found a sufficient purification in any case by the washing of the clothes and remaining unclean until the evening. In cases of a secondary defilement of other things, they also must be similarly purified, or be destroyed. Even the eating of a clean animal which had died a natural death required no deeper purification. Here, then, the line is very distinctly drawn between ceremonial defilement and moral sin, even when both were incurred by the same act.

III. All commands to holiness, whether expressed by symbolical act, or to be wrought out in the efforts of the spirit, rest upon the same ground, **For I am the Lord your God, ... I am holy.**—This is the teaching alike of the Old and the New Testaments, and again brings out in a striking way the impossibility of any true communion between God and man except on the basis of man's restoration to holiness. This teaching has been already seen to be the object of the Levitical law in regard to sacrifices, and it is here none the less so when the law enters into the details of man's daily life.

IV. While the uncleannesses here enumerated were purged simply and speedily if attended to at once, if neglected, they required (v. 2) the more serious expiation of the sin offering. Such is the nature of sin; like leaven, it is ever prone to spread and intensify its effects.

V. "The cleanness of the animals for sacrifice and the purification of the sacrificer. Chaps. xi.—xvi."

"Through sacrifice Israel is made holy, *i. e.*, they become in the fellowship of a personal God, a people of personal dignity belonging to God. The preliminary condition of sanctification by fire is the purification especially produced by water and blood. Only clean, or rather, purified men can serve as sacrificers in the presentation of clean animals."

"Clean men must be circumcised, sanctified by the symbol of circumcision to the new birth under the power of Jehovah, and thus especially taken out from the confusion of the unclean world; and so, too, the clean animals, as animals of civilization, form a contrast to the unclean creation, as the elite of domestic animals, some of which are too human, too sympathetic (horse, ass, and dog), while swine are too brutally unclean to become domestic animals for the Israelites."

"Cleanness is the negative side of holiness, and so purification is the negative side of sanctification." Lange, *Dogmatik zum Lev.*

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The homiletical teaching of this chapter may be briefly summed up in the weighty words of the Apostolic proverb (1 Cor. xv. 33) "Evil communications corrupt good manners." It is easy to deceive ourselves here. It is easy to work out plausible reasons why particular divine commands may not be founded in the nature of things, and hence may not be of binding force upon us. But all God's commands are binding, and he who chooses to violate them, however unimportant they may seem to him to be, incurs the risk of making himself an abomination.

Sins in matters of little importance, intrinsically and inadvertently committed, may, through the means which God has provided, be readily put away on repentance, and a true seeking of restored communion; but if neglected, or passed over because they seem of little moment, they lead to a heavier guiltiness.

The defiling effect of personal contact with that which is unclean is set forth in this chapter. Origen, in treating of it, calls attention to the corresponding effect of contact with that which is holy as illustrated by the restoration to life of the body of the man which touched the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21), and of the woman whose issue of blood was staunched when she had touched the hem of the Saviour's garment (Matt. ix. 20). Both serve to show the influence exerted upon us by our associations; the spirit as surely as the body is defiled by contact with the unclean, and elevated by association with the pure.

Certain moral qualities of men are commonly described by reference to the animal creation. As this is frequently done in the New Testament (Matt. vii. 15; x. 16; xxiii. 33; Luke xiii. 32; Phil. iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 22, *etc.*), so it appears always to have been common among mankind. Therefore, in the classification as clean, of those animals associated with excellent qualities, and as unclean of those associated with evil qualities, a praise of virtue and a condemnation of evil was introduced into the domestic associations of the daily life. The necessity of such teaching has passed away with the coming of the clearer light of the Gospel.

Parting the hoof and chewing the cud are two marks of the clean animal which go together, and must both be found; though one may be apparently possessed, yet if the other is wanting, the animal is unclean. This Origen applies to one who meditates upon and understands the Scriptures, but does not order his life in accordance with their teaching. So it may be applied to faith and works; neither can truly exist without the other, and the semblance of either alone is unavailing.

Positive Divine laws, simply as laws, and even without regard to their immediate object, have a high moral value from their educationary power. From the garden of Eden down, man has been always subjected to such laws. As disobedience to them has resulted in harm, and placed the transgressor in an attitude of opposition to God; so has the faithful effort to obey them resulted in blessing, and brought those who have undertaken it into nearer relations to God. Whether the ground of the command could be understood, or whether the act enjoined or forbidden might seem to man morally colorless, yet the simple habit of obedience has always had a most salutary effect. "A law, the fitness and utility of which we cannot discover by our natural reason, is more a test of the spirit of obedience than a moral requirement that commends itself to our judgment

as good and proper; because our compliance with the latter may be but a compliment to our own intelligence, and not at all an act of deference to the divine authority." Hallam. The multitude of daily demands made upon the obedience of the Israelites offered to them a great opportunity of blessing, and is repeatedly declared to have been a test whether they had a heart to do God's will or no. Under the higher dispensation of the Gospel we are allowed to see more clearly the grounds of the Divine commands; nevertheless, the opportunities of rendering obedience, simply as obedience, without seeing the grounds upon which the command rests, is by no means entirely withdrawn from the Christian. Such opportunities improved are means of blessing, and become to us one of the many ways in which we "walk by faith and not by sight."

SECOND SECTION.

"The purification and cleanness of the human conditions of the offerers. The lying-in women. The leprosy in men, in garments, in houses. Sexual impurities and purifications. Chaps. XII.—XV."—LANGE.

Laws of Purification after Childbirth.

CHAPTER XII.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a woman have conceived[1] seed, and born a man child, then she shall be unclean seven days; according to [as[2]] the days of the separation for her infirmity
3 shall she be unclean. And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be cir-
4 cumcised. And she shall then continue in[3] the blood of her purifying three and thirty days; she shall touch no hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until
5 the days of her purifying be fulfilled. But if she bear a maid child, then she shall be unclean two weeks, as in her separation: and she shall continue in the blood of
6 her purifying threescore and six days. And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb [sheep[4]] of the first year for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtledove, for a sin offering,
7 unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, unto the priest: who shall offer it before the LORD, and [5]make an atonement for her; and she shall be cleansed from the issue of her blood. This *is* the law for her that hath born a male or a
8 female. And if she be not able to bring a lamb [one of the flock[6]], then she shall bring two turtles, or two young pigeons; the one for the burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for her, and she shall be clean.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. תַּזְרִיעַ. The Sam. here has the Niphal. Comp. Gen. i. 11 for similar use of Hiphil.

[2] Ver. 2. כִּימֵי. The text institutes a comparison, saying that the one is the same as the other, rather than makes one the law for the other.

[3] Ver. 4. עַל. There is no distinction in the A. V. between this and the preposition of the preceding verse. Two MSS. read here also בִּדְמֵי as in ver. 4.

[4] Ver. 6. כֶּבֶשׂ. See Textual Note [5] on iii. 7.

[5] Ver. 7. One MS., the Sam., LXX., and Syr., here supply the word *priest*, which is necessarily understood from the connection.

[6] Ver. 8. שֵׂה a different word from that in ver. 6, and used either of sheep or goats, but according to Fürst, only of the young of either.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Here begins a new *parashah* of the law extending to xiii. 59; the parallel section of the prophets is 2 Kings iv. 42—v. 19, a prominent subject of which is the cleansing of Naaman from his leprosy.

The previous chapter was addressed to Moses and Aaron conjointly, and so is the following, the latter part of ch. xiv. (beginning at ver. 33), and ch. xv.; the present chapter and the earlier part of ch. xiv. are addressed to Moses alone. The reason of this difference seems to lie in the fact that the parts addressed to Moses alone are simple commands given to him as the legislator,

requiring no exercise of judgment in their application; while those addressed to both called for more or less of a discrimination which was entrusted by the law to the priests.

The previous chapter treated of uncleanness of men arising from the lower animals which, if attended to promptly, in no case required more for its purification than ablutions, and continued only until evening. This and the three following chapters treat of uncleanness arising from the human body, in most cases requiring expiatory sacrifices with various, and often prolonged, periods before the purification became complete. The various sources of this defilement are: child-bearing (xii.); leprosy (xiii., xiv.); and certain secretions (xv.); to these is added in Num. xix. 11–16 the most intense of all defilements, that arising from contact with a human corpse. The omission of a vast mass of other sources of impurity, and restriction of rites of purification to these few, certainly indicates (as Keil has shown) that these are not simply regulations for the promotion of cleanliness, or of good morals and decency, but had a higher symbolical and educational meaning. The defilement of child-bearing, which occupies the present chapter, is placed first not only because birth is the natural starting point for the treatment of all that concerns the human body, but also plainly to prevent any possible confusion between this defilement and those mentioned in ch. xv. 19–30. There is indeed a certain degree of connection between the two, and this made it all the more necessary that this should be treated by itself, as being a different thing and resting upon different grounds.

In regard to purifications in general, Kalisch says: "Next to sacrifices, purifications were the most important part of Hebrew rituals. Whenever both were prescribed together, the latter appeared indeed as merely preparatory to the former, since sacrifices were deemed the main agency of restored peace or holiness; but purifications, like offerings, were frequently ordained as separate and independent acts of worship: closely entwined with the thoughts and habits of the Hebrews, they formed an essential part of their religious system. . . . . The Hebrews 'purified,' or, as they understood the term, sanctified themselves, whenever they desired to rise to the Deity, that is, before solemn ceremonies and seasons, as sacrifices and festivals (Gen. xxxv. 2–4; 1 Sam. xvi. 5; comp. 2 Chron. xxx. 17); or whenever they expected the Deity to descend to them by some supernatural manifestation, as a disclosure of heavenly wisdom, or a deed of miraculous power and help (Ex. xix. 10, 14, 15; Josh. iii. 5; vii. 13). Therefore, when in a state of impurity, they were forbidden to enter the sanctuary, to keep the Passover, and to partake of holy food, whether of sacrificial meat, of sacred offerings and gifts, or of shew bread, because the clean only were fit to approach the holy God and all that appertains to Him (Lev. vii. 19–21; xxii. 3 ss.; Num. ix. 6 ss.; xviii. 11, 13; 1 Sam. xxi. 5)." Later he adds: "If compared with the purificatory laws of other nations, those of the Pentateuch appear in a favorable light. . . . . They exhibit no vestige of a dualism; in every detail they are stamped by the monotheistic creed; God alone, the merciful, wise and omnipotent Ruler, sends trials and diseases; and no evil genius has the power of causing uncleanness. They are singular in the noble principles on which they are framed—the perfection and holiness of God; and they are thereby raised above frivolity and unmeaning formalism. Moreover, it would be unjust to deny that they were understood as symbols, or as means of sanctification; to defile oneself and to sin, and also to cleanse and to hallow, are frequently used as equivalents. They must be pronounced simple if considered side by side with those of the Parsees, the Hindoos, the Egyptians, or the Talmud."

The connection here hinted at between uncleanness and sin, between purity and holiness, is a very important one. It rests partly on a symbolism which finds place in all languages, and is abundantly recognized in the diction of the New Testament; and partly upon that actual connection existing between the soul and the body (spoken of in the last chapter), whereby the one is deeply affected by the state and condition of the other. In both respects the educational value of the Levitical laws of purity to a people in their spiritual infancy were of the utmost value. The importance of the symbolism was further enhanced by the broad distinction made between defilements arising from human and those from other sources, and connecting the sin offering only with the former.

This chapter consists of two parts: vers. 1–5 relate to the time of seclusion, vers. 6–8 to the means of purification. The following are Lange's Exegetical Notes on the chapter in full:

"The origin of life makes man unclean in regard to his theocratic right of communion; just as death, or the touch of the dead, and no less that which impairs life—sickness, especially as it is represented by the leprosy, and so also every disturbance of the springs of life. But this surely does not mean that finite life itself was thought of as unclean, and that it must therefore be reconciled to the universal life (Bæhr II., p. 461, opposed to which Sommer and Keil); and it also does not mean that original sin alone has produced all this darkening of life, although the natural condition appears here throughout laden with sinfulness; since we find directions for the purification of lying-in women among the most different nations (see Knobel, p. 466)." [The following brief summary of some of these is given by Clark: "The Hindoo law pronounced the mother of a newborn child to be impure for forty days, required the father to bathe as soon as the birth had taken place, and debarred the whole family for a period from religious rites, while they were to 'confine themselves to an inward remembrance of the Deity:' in a Brahmin family this rule extended to all relations within the fourth degree, for ten days, at the end of which they had to bathe. According to the Parsee law, the mother and child were bathed, and the mother had to live in seclusion for forty days, after which she had to undergo other purifying rites. The Arabs are said by Burckhardt to regard

the mother as unclean for forty days. The ancient Greeks suffered neither child-birth nor death to take place within consecrated places: both mother and child were bathed, and the mother was not allowed to approach an altar for forty days. The term of forty days, it is evident, was generally regarded as a critical one for both the mother and the child.—The day on which the Romans gave the name to the child, the eighth day for a girl, and the ninth for a boy, was called *lustricus dies*, 'the day of purification,' because certain lustral rites in behalf of the child were performed on the occasion, and some sort of offering was made. The *Amphidromia* of the Greeks was a similar lustration for the child, when the name was given, probably between the seventh and tenth days (Menu v. 62; Ayeen Akbery, Vol. II., p. 556; Zend Avesta, ap. Bähr; Thucid. III. 104; Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 382; Callim. *Hym. ad Jov.* 16, *Hym. ad Del.* 123; Censorin. *De Die Nat.* c. xi., p. 51; Celsus, II. 1; Festus, s. *Lustrici Dies* with the note in Lindemann, II. 480; Smith, *Dict. of Antiq.* s. *Amphidromia*)."—F. G.]—"But, in general, by this establishment of the uncleanness of the natural processes of birth and death, the truth was expressed, that the ideal life of man was already a kind of immortal life, which had to raise itself above the natural conditions of human life—the natural side of his being—and set itself in opposition thereto."

"If now any one says that all these regulations are not to be considered under the aspect of sanitary or dietetic, but only of typical or religious precepts, we must hold this antithesis to be thoroughly false; there are plain indications that always, from the tree of knowledge down, especially from the circumcision, the one particular was joined with the other."

"Ver. 2 ss. In regard to the uncleanness of lying-in women, in the first place there are two conditions to be distinguished: first, the time of their especial sickness; secondly, the time of their recovery through the blood (the issue of blood) of their purification. These times differ according as she has borne a son or a daughter. If the child be a boy, the time of her especial sickness is fixed at seven days, exactly like the regulation in regard to the monthly courses. Then on the eighth day the circumcision of the boy was to follow, and from that time for thirty-three days—the eighth day reckoned in—she was to remain at home with the boy, engaged in a constant process of recovery and purification. But why are the seven days of her especial uncleanness doubled to two weeks by the birth of a girl? It is said that this has its foundation in the belief of antiquity that "the bloody and watery issues last longer after the birth of a female than of a male" (see the citations from Hippocrates [*op. ed.* Kühn. i. p. 393], Aristotle [*Hist. anim.* vi. 22; vii. 3], and Burdach [*Physiologie* III., p. 34] in Keil). Whether this view formed a natural reason for the above regulation or not, there was certainly also a theocratic reason of importance: the boy was circumcised—the girl was not; for this the twice seven days might form an equivalent. The girl was so far a Jewess, but not yet an Israelitess" [*i. e.* a descendant of Abraham after the flesh, but not yet incorporated with the chosen people.—F. G.]. "It was now moreover the proper consequence that the thirty-three days of recovery were doubled to sixty-six days, wherein, indeed, the law of circumcision is still more strongly reflected. The totality of the forty days of purification at the birth of a boy corresponds to the former explanation of the forty days in the life of Moses and Elijah: it is the symbolical time of purification, of exclusion from the world, as it was extended for the whole people to forty years. And the doubling of the forty days in the case of the new-born girl explains itself, if forty days are reckoned for the girl and forty for the mother; a doubling which could not be applied to the circumcised boy. Moreover, the coöperation of the physical view, already noticed, may be also taken into consideration." [It is particularly to be noticed that the *uncleanness* continued only seven or fourteen days. During this time it appears from the analogy of xv. 19-24, the woman was unclean in the sense that every person and thing touched by her became itself unclean and capable of communicating defilement. After this period, the woman was no longer *unclean*, but might perform at home all the ordinary duties of domestic life; only she was forbidden to approach the sanctuary (*i. e.*, the court of the tabernacle) until the time of her purification. The suggestion of Lange (which was also the opinion of Calvin) that the difference in the length of time for the uncleanness and the purification at the birth of a boy or a girl was due to the fact of the boy's being formally received into the visible Church of God by circumcision, is a complete and satisfactory solution of a long-vexed question; but this solution necessarily carries with it the determination that the law had respect to the child as well as to the mother. To this two objections are proposed: first, the case of still-born children; but this was so exceptional that there was no occasion to provide for it in the law. When it did occur—if the principle above given is correct—there being no child for whom purification was required, the time would probably have been reduced to that which was considered necessary for the mother alone. The other objection arises from the necessity of including the infant Jesus in the purification of the Virgin Mary, Luke ii. 22 (where it is very observable that the Evangelist does not hesitate to say *τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν**), but this is easily disposed of on the principle announced by Himself in regard to His baptism that "thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15). This is the view taken by S. Augustine (Quæst. in Hept. L. III. 40).—F. G.].

"Ver. 6. The equalization of girls with boys appears again in the appointed completing sacrifice." [That is, in the time at which it was offered; there was no distinction in the sacrifice itself.—F. G.]. "And in this there is not first a sin offering brought, and then a burnt offering, as in the trespass offerings; but first a costly burnt offering, as the expression of the consecration of the new life;—namely, a year old lamb, and then a sin offering small in propor-

* In note on Luke ii. 22 the view taken by Oosterzee is that the plural refers to Mary and *Joseph*.

tion, a young pigeon, or a turtle-dove." [This order of the offerings is a remarkable deviation from the general principle that when the two offerings came together, the sin offering always preceded. The reason of this exception appears to lie in the fact that at the birth of a child feelings of joy and gratitude are naturally uppermost; the thought of the child's heritage of sinfulness comes afterward.—F. G.]. "Only in case of necessity was the burnt offering reduced and made the same as in the sin offering." [This necessity seems to have been liberally interpreted by custom, and the smaller offering to have been allowed generally to the humbler classes of society. Comp. Luke ii. 22-24. The time of the offering also could not be before the fortieth or the eightieth day, but only a very strict construction of the law could forbid its being deferred to a later period for those living at a distance from the sanctuary, as appears to have been done at the birth of Samuel, 1 Sam. i. 22-25.—F. G.]. "That bearing and being born, as well as being unclean through sickness and touching the dead, could not be thought of without human complicity in sin, or at least in guilt, was set forth by this law; but how gently was this judgment expressed! If it is now said of this sacrifice from one point of view: **for a son, for a daughter** [ver. 6], and then again so **she shall be clean** [ver. 8], so again is the time, just as much as the sacrifice of purification, designated as common for mother and child. Keil is thus incorrect when he supposes that the woman did not require purification for the child, but only for herself. According to the fundamental principles of the Levitical law, it could not be conceived that a clean child lay on the breast of an unclean mother. In this very community of the Levitical uncleanness, this inner fellowship between mother and child is raised above the supposed separation in their condition. It is evident that the thing here treated of is indefinite sinfulness, but not "sins becoming known indirectly in the corporeal manifestation of them."

"Upon the laws of purity among other nations in regard to women in childbed, see Knobel, p. 466, and so too on the circumcision, p. 467."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. "The theocratic law is joined throughout with the sanitary law, without giving up its predominating and symbolical Levitical signification. In the law of lying-in women there comes especially into notice the connection or unity between mother and child, and the difference between the man-child and the woman-child. See the Exegetical." Lange.

II. "The doctrine, echoed in a hundred creeds, that 'Purity is, next to life, the highest boon of man,' was among them also [the Israelites] a truth and a reality." Kalisch.

III. "The fall casts a shade of impenetrable darkness over the birth of a child of man. All that reason can say is, that this is another child of sin and heir of death. . . . The mother in Israel is here taught that while there is impurity and guilt connected with the bearer and the born of the fallen race, yet there is a propitiation on which she may rely for herself and for her offspring, and a purification which she has for herself, and may confidently expect for her child, while she trains him up in the way he should go." Murphy.

IV. This chapter shows clearly in the difference between the times of uncleanness and of purification at the birth of a boy and of a girl, the difference in relation to the ancient church brought about by circumcision. The Christian church has taken the place of the Jewish, and baptism has taken the place of circumcision; the same relation therefore may be expected to hold between these.

V. Inasmuch as a sin offering was to be presented conjointly for the mother and the newborn child, the doctrine of original sin is plainly taught in this law. Origen (Hom. viii. in Lev., § 3) draws the same conclusion from the fact that baptism is appointed "for the remission of sins," and yet is administered to infants.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

As the primeval curse on sin fell, for the woman, on child-bearing, so in child-bearing she becomes by the law unclean, and must present for her purification a *sin* offering. That curse remains and still clings to every child of sin coming into the world; for purification resort must be had to that true Propitiation for sin of which the sin offering was a type.

"As the mother and her child emerge out of the impurity, she learns to hope for the day when both will emerge out of the bondage and corruption of sin; as the child is circumcised on the eighth day, the confiding parents pray and wait and watch and work for the circumcision of the heart, which is hopefully foreshadowed by the outward rite; as the mother offers her burnt sacrifice and sin sacrifice she rejoices in the knowledge that there is a propitiation that is sufficient for her, and for her children, and for her children's children to all generations." Murphy.

"The priestly people of God have always a war to wage with the defilements of the natural life. Even the uncleanness which belongs to the natural vigor of a lying-in woman, and to a newborn child, must be taken away and atoned for." Lange.

In accordance with this law, "on the fortieth day after His birth from the Blessed Virgin's womb, Christ, the second Adam, our Emmanuel, was presented in the substance of our flesh; and on the fortieth day after His resurrection, or birth from the grave (Col. i. 18; Rev. i. 5), He was presented in our flesh in the heavenly sanctuary, and we were presented in Him in the dress of a cleansed and glorified humanity." Wordsworth.

THIRD SECTION.

Laws Concerning Leprosy

CHAPS. XIII., XIV.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

The disease of leprosy has happily become so rare in modern times in the better known parts of the world that much obscurity rests upon its pathology. The attempt will only be made here to point out those matters which may be considered as fixed by common consent, but which will be found sufficient for the illustration of the more important points in the following chapters.

In the first place, then, it appears indisputable that *leprosy* is a broad name covering several varieties of disease more or less related to one another. These are separable into two main classes, one covering the different forms of *Elephantiasis* (tuberculated and anæsthetic); the other, the *Lepra vulgaris, Psoriasis, Syphilis, etc.* It is the former class alone with which Leviticus has to do as a disease. At the present time the tuberculated variety is said to be the more common in those countries in which leprosy still exists to any considerable extent, while the anæsthetic was probably more prevalent in the time of Moses. The latter is described by Celsus under the name of *λεύκη*, and Keil maintains that the laws of Moses in regard to leprosy in man relate exclusively to this. Clark, however, has shown "that the two in a great number of cases work together, and as it did in the days of Moses, the disease appears occasionally in an ambiguous form." Wilson has recorded a number of cases in detail, showing the interchange of the two forms in the same patient. The symptoms of the disease intended by Moses sufficiently appear in the text itself, and if these symptoms cover what would now appear in medical nomenclature as different diseases, then all those diseases, classified under the general name of *leprosy* were intended to be included in the Levitical legislation.

Nothing whatever is said in the law either of the origin, the contagiousness, or the cure of the disease. In modern experience it seems to have been sufficiently proved that it is hereditary, but only to the extent of three or four generations, when it gradually disappears; neither is it in all cases hereditary, the children of lepers being sometimes entirely unaffected by leprosy, and on the other hand the disease often appearing without any hereditary taint. In its first appearance it is now often marked only by some slight "spot" upon the skin, giving no pain or other inconvenience, but obstinately resisting all efforts at removal, and slowly but irresistibly spreading. Sometimes months, sometimes years, even to the extent of twenty or thirty years, intervene between the first appearance of the "spots" and their development. It is not improbable that in the course of many centuries a considerable modification in the rapidity of its progress may have taken place in a disease which is found gradually to die out by hereditary transmission. The question of its contagiousness is still much mooted among the medical faculty. The better opinion seems to be that it is not immediately contagious, but is propagated by prolonged and intimate intercourse in the case of susceptible persons. At least it is certain that in all known instances of the prevalence of the disease one of the most important of the means of control has been the segregation of the lepers, and where this precaution has been neglected, the disease has continued to prevail. After the leprosy has once acquired a certain degree of development, there is no known means of cure. Everything hitherto attempted has been found to rather aggravate than mitigate the disorder. It is asserted that it yields to medical treatment in its earliest stages when the "spots" first appear, and a number of distinct cases of cure are recorded; but the doubt will always remain whether the disease which yields is really leprosy, or whether something else has not been confounded with an undeveloped stage of the true disease. However this may be, it is certain that after it has once become developed to any considerable extent it is incurable by any remedies at present known, although spontaneous cures do sometimes occur. The reliance for its control is more upon diet, cleanliness, and general regimen, than upon specific antidotes.

Medical observations upon the disease in modern times have been made in the island of Guadaloupe, where it broke out about the middle of the last century, and was very carefully investigated by M. Peyssonel, a physician sent out by the French government for the purpose. An account of the result of his examination, as well as of other investigations of English, French, and German physicians in other islands of the West Indies whither it had been imported from Africa, and in other parts of the world is given by Michaelis (*Laws of Moses*, Art. 208, 210). Also of especial importance is a "Report on the leprosy in Norway by Dr. Danielssen, chief physician of the leper hospital at Bergen, and Prof. Boeck" (Paris, 1848). The subject of late years has considerably interested physicians, and the London "College of physicians" have published a report upon it, based upon a series of questions addressed to nearly all parts of the world where the disease now prevails. Many other authorities are cited by Clark in his preliminary note

to these chapters. A particularly valuable discussion of the disease may be found in Wilson, *Diseases of the skin*, ch. xiii. (5th Am. Ed., pp. 300–314 and 333–381). The disease appears to have been more or less common in Western Europe from the eighth century down, but received a great extension at the time of the crusades. At one time a partial enumeration by Dugdale mentions eighty-five leper houses in England alone, six of which were in London, and it continued to linger in Scotland until the middle of the last century. It still exists to a considerable extent in Iceland and Norway, and in all the countries bordering the Eastern shores of the Mediterranean, especially Syria and Egypt, where it has found a home in all ages, in some parts of Africa, Arabia, and India.

The characteristics of the disease are the exceedingly slight symptoms at its first appearance; its insidious, and usually very slow progress, the horribly repulsive features of its later stages when the face becomes shockingly disfigured, and often the separate joints of the body become mortified and drop off one by one; and its usually sudden and unexpected termination at the last, when the leprosy reaches some vital organ, and gives rise to secondary disease, often dysentery, by which life is ended. Meanwhile, during the earlier stages, generally very prolonged, there is no suffering, and the ordinary enjoyments of life are uninterrupted.

Leprosy, with these characteristics, especially its hidden origin, and its insidious and resistless progress, has always seemed a mysterious disease, and among the heathen as well as among the Jews, has been looked upon as an infliction especially coming from God. In fact in Hebrew history it was so often employed in Divine judgments, as in the case of Miriam, of Gehazi, and of Uzziah, and was also so often healed by miraculous interposition, as in the case of Miriam also, and of Naaman, as to give some reason for this belief; while the peculiar treatment it received in the law tended still further to place leprosy in a position of alienation from the theocratic state, and actually included the leper in that "uncleanness" which was utterly excluded from approach to the sanctuary. The disease thus became a vivid symbolism of sin, and of the opposition in which this stands to the holiness of God; while at the same time its revolting aspect in its later stages made it such an image, and indeed a beginning, of death itself that it is often most appropriately described by Jewish as well as other writers as "a living death." Much of the association with death and the body in the corruption of death, thus attached to leprosy and the corruption at work in leprosy. It is not necessary here to speak of the prevailing Hebrew notion that all suffering was the consequence of individual sin, and was proportioned in severity to the degree of that sin; for however deeply seated such ideas may have been in the minds of many of the Israelites, and however much they may have increased the popular dread and abhorrence of leprosy, they find no shadow of encouragement whatever in the law.

In regard to what is called "leprosy" in houses, in textile fabrics, and in leather, it is not necessary to suppose that the name is intended to convey the idea of an organic disease in these inanimate things. The law will still be sufficiently clear if we look upon the name as merely applied in these cases to express a kind of disintegration or corruption, such as could be most readily and popularly described, from certain similarities in appearance, by the figurative use of the word. In the same way the terms *out of joint*, *sick*, and others have come among ourselves to be popularly used of inanimate things, and such words as *blistered*, *bald*, and *rotten*, have a technical figurative sense almost more common than their original literal one. These modes of disintegration have been often investigated with great learning and labor; but it is not surprising that at this distance of time, and after such profound changes in the arts and the habits of men, the result of all such investigations should remain somewhat unsatisfactory. Just enough has been ascertained to show that inanimate things, of the classes here described, are subject to processes of decay which might be aptly described by the word leprosy; but precisely what the processes were to which the Levitical law had reference it is probably impossible now to ascertain definitely. The most satisfactory treatment of the subject from this point of view is to be found in Michaelis (*ubi supra*, Art. 211). He instances in regard to houses, the formation of saltpetre or other nitrous salts upon the walls to such an extent in some parts of Germany as to become an article of commercial importance, and to be periodically scraped off for the market. By others the existence of iron pyrites in the dolomitic limestone used for building in Palestine has been suggested as leading in its decomposition to precisely the appearances described in the law—hollow streaks of the green ferrous sulphate and the red of ferric sulphate—upon the walls of the houses affected; but proof is wanting of the existence in that stone of pyrites in sufficient abundance to produce the effects contemplated in the law. Both these explanations, however, are suggestive of methods of disintegration which might have occurred, but for the determination of which we have not sufficient data. It is the same with the explanation of Michaelis in regard to woolen fabrics,—that the wool itself is affected by diseases of the sheep upon which it has grown. The fact itself does not seem sufficiently well authenticated; nor if it were, would it be applicable to garments of linen. Nevertheless, this is suggestive of defects in the materials,—which were in all cases of organic production—arising either from diseased growth, or from unskilfulness in the art of their preparation, which would after a time manifest themselves in the product, much in the same way as old books now sometimes become spotted over with a "leprosy" arising from an insufficient removal of the chemicals employed in the preparation of the paper pulp.

But whatever the nature and origin of this sort of "leprosy," it is plainly regarded in the Levitical law as is no sense contagious, or in any way calculated to produce directly injurious effects upon man. It is provided for in the law, it would appear, partly on the general ground of the inculcation of cleanliness, and partly from

association with the human disease to which it bore an external resemblance, and to which the utmost repugnance was to be encouraged. Even the likeness and suggestion of leprosy was to be held unclean in the homes of Israel.

No mention has thus far been made of a theory of this disease adopted by many physicians, and which, if established, might really assimilate the leprosy in houses and garments and skins to that in the human body, and explain the origin of all alike by the same cause. According to this theory, the disease is occasioned by vegetable spores, which find a suitable *nidus* for their development either in the human skin or in the other substances mentioned. If this theory should be accepted, the origin and effects of the disintegrating agencies would be the same in all cases. The late eminent physician, Dr. J. K. Mitchell, in his work upon the origin of malarious and epidemic fevers (*Five Essays*, p. 94), after quoting the law in relation to leprosy, says: "There is here described a disease whose cause must have been of organic growth, capable of living in the human being, and of creating there a foul and painful disease of contagious character, while it could also live and reproduce itself in garments of wool, linen, or skin; nay more, it could attach itself to the walls of a house, and there also effect its own reproduction. Animalcules, always capable of choice, would scarcely be found so transferable; and we are therefore justified in supposing that *green or red fungi so often seen in epidemic periods*, were the protean disease of man, and his garment, and his house." He further quotes from Hecker statements corroboratory of his views in regard to the *plagues* of 786 and 959. This theory, however, has not here been urged, partly because it yet needs further proof, partly because no theory at all is necessary to account for the Levitical legislation in view of the facts presented in the law.

For the literature of the subject, besides the reference above given, see the art. by Hayman, *Leper, Leprosy*, in Smith's *Bibl. Dict.*, and the Preliminary note on these chapters in Clark's *Com. on Lev.*, together with the appended notes to the same.

At the opening of his "Exegetical" Lange has the following, which may be appropriately placed here: "First of all, it must be made prominent that the leprosy, under the point of view taken, and the sentence of uncleanness, is placed as a companion to the uncleanness of birth, as the representative of all ways of death, of all sicknesses. It is unclean first in itself, as a death element in the stream of life—in the blood—even as the source of life appears disturbed in the relations of birth; but still more it is unclean as a sickness spreading by transmission and contagion.

"Hence it appears also as a polluting element of physical corruption, not only in men, but also through the analogy of an evil diffusing itself, in human garments and dwellings. The analogous evils of these were, on this account, called leprosy.

"In this extension over man and his whole sphere it is, in its characteristics, a speaking picture of sin and of evil the punishment of sin; it is, so to speak, the plastic manifestation, the medical phantom or representation of all the misery of sin.

"Accordingly the leprosy, and the contact with it, is the specific uncleanness which excluded the bearer of it from the theocratic community, so that he, as the typically excommunicated person, must dwell without the camp.

"Nothing is here said of the application of human means of healing in reference to this evil. The leper was left with his sickness to the mercy of God and to the wonderfully deep antithesis of recovery and death; the more so, since leprosy in a peculiar sense is a chronic crisis, a progressive disease, continually secreting matter, whether for life or for death. Mention is made of external counteraction only in regard to leprosy in garments and houses. Hence, from its nature, it is altogether placed under the supervision of the priest. The priest knew the characteristics of the leprosy, and the course of its crises; he had accordingly to decide upon the exclusion and upon the restoration of the sick, and to express the latter by the performance of the sacrifice of purification brought for this purpose by the convalescent.

"Thus in conformity to the spirit of Oriental antiquity, the priest here appears as the physician also for bodily sicknesses, as a watchman over the public health. But for the cosmic evils he was still less a match than for those of the body; against such the prophet must reveal miraculous helps, *e. g.*, against the bitterness of the water, and against the bite of the fiery serpents.

"The great contrast between the Old and the New Testaments is made prominent in the fact, that in the Old Testament the touch of the leper made unclean,—apparently even leprous;—while Christ by His touch of the lepers cleansed them from their leprosy. But it continued to be left to the priest, as the representative of the old covenant, to pronounce the fact. See Comm. S. Matt., p. 150."

"The name Leprosy, צָרַעַת is derived from צָרַע to strike down, to strike to the ground; the leprosy is the stroke of God. Gesenius distinguishes the leprosy in men, the leprosy in houses (probably the injury done by saltpetre), and the leprosy in garments (mould, mildew). On this chronic form of sickness, fully equal to the acute form of the plague, comp. the article *Leprosy* (Aussatz) in the dictionaries, especially in Herzog's *Real-encyclopädie*, and in Winer. Four principal forms are distinguished, of which three are particularly described by Winer: 1) The white leprosy, *Barras*, *λευκή*. "This prevailed among the Hebrews (2 Kings v. 27, *etc.*) and has hence been called by physicians *lepra Mosaica*. See the description in Winer, I. p. 114. 2) The *Elephantiasis*, *lepra nodosa*, or *tuberculosa*, tubercular leprosy, Egyptian boil, thus endemic in Egypt. "The sickness of Job was commonly considered in antiquity to have been this kind of leprosy." 3) The black leprosy or the dark *Barras*. Later medical researches (to which the articles in Bertheau's *Conversations-lexicon*, and Schenkel's *Bibel-lexicon* refer) show the differences between the various kinds as less defined;

the contagious character is called in question by Furrer (in Schenkel). In this matter indeed, it is a question whether the rigid isolation of the leprous has not hindered, in a great degree, the examples of contagion." For a catalogue of the literature, see Knobel, p. 469 and beyond.

A.—EXAMINATION AND ITS RESULT.

Chapter XIII. 1–46.

1, 2 And the Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, saying, When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh a rising, a scab, or bright spot, and it be in the skin of the flesh *like* the plague [a spot[1]] of leprosy; then he shall be brought unto Aaron the
3 priest, or unto one of his sons the priests: and the priest shall look on the plague [spot[1]] in the skin of the flesh: and *when* the hair in the plague [spot[1]] is turned[3] white, and the plague [spot[1]] in sight *be* deeper than the skin[2] of his flesh, it *is* a plague [spot[1]] of leprosy: and the priest shall look on him, and pronounce him
4 unclean. If the bright spot *be* white in the skin of his flesh, and in sight *be* not deeper than the skin, and the hair thereof be not turned[3] white; then the priest
5 shall shut up *him that hath* the plague [shall bind up the spot[4]] seven days: and the priest shall look on him the seventh day: and, behold, *if* the plague [spot[1]] in his sight be at a stay, *and* the plague [spot[1]] spread not in the skin; then the
6 priest shall shut him up [shall bind it up[4]] seven days more: and the priest shall look on him again the seventh day: and, behold, *if* the plague *be* somewhat dark [spot[1] *be* somewhat faint[5]], *and*[6] the plague [spot[1]] spread not in the skin, the priest shall pronounce him clean: it *is but* a scab: and he shall wash his clothes, and be
7 clean. But if the scab spread much abroad in the skin, after that he hath been
8 seen of the priest for his cleansing, he shall be seen of the priest again: and *if* the priest see that, behold, the scab spreadeth in the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a leprosy.
9 When[7] the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy is in a man, then he shall be brought unto
10 the priest; and the priest shall see *him:* and, behold, *if* the rising *be* white in the

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

Note.—A free translation of this chapter in terms of modern medical science may be found in Wilson, p. 377.

[1] Ver. 2. נֶגַע, a word of very frequent occurrence in these two chapters where it is uniformly translated in the A. V. (except xiii. 42, 43, *sore*) *plague*, as it is also in Gen. xii. 17; Ex. xi. 1; Deut. xxiv. 8 (in reference also to leprosy); 1 Kings viii. 37, 38; Ps. xci. 10. Elsewhere the renderings of the A. V. are very various: *sore, stroke, stripe, wound.* By far the most common rendering in the LXX. is ἁφή=*tactus, ictus.* The idea of the word is a *stroke* or *blow*, and then the effect of this in a *wound* or *spot.* Clark therefore would translate here *stroke*, which meets well enough the meaning of the word itself, but does not in all cases convey the sense in English. It is perhaps impossible to find one word in English which can be used in all cases; but that which seems best adapted to Leviticus is the one given by Horsley and Lee, and adopted here: *spot.* So Keil, Wilson and others. There is no article in the Heb.

[2] Ver. 3. The sense is here undoubtedly *the scarf skin* (Clark), *the cuticle*, in contradistinction to *the cutis*, the true skin below. So Wilson, who says: "This distinction in reality constitutes one of the most important points of diagnosis between real leprosy and affections of the skin otherwise resembling leprosy." But as we have in Heb. only the one word עוֹר for both (except the ἅπ. λέγ. גֶּלֶד, Job xvi. 15), there does not seem to be warrant for changing the translation, especially as in English *skin* answers to either with the same indefiniteness.

[3] Ver. 4. The construction in vers. 3, 4 and 10 is without a preposition; in vers. 16 and 17 it is with the preposition לְ, as is expressed in the A. V.

[4] Vers. 4, 5, *etc.* According to Rosenmüller and Gesenius, נֶגַע is used by metonymy for the person upon whom it is. This view is adopted by Lange. It appears in the Targ. of Onk. and in the Vulg., and has been followed by the A. V. Far better is the rendering of the Sam., LXX. and Syr.: *the priest shall bind up the spot, or sore.* This is the exact translation of the Heb., and is advocated by Horsley, Boothroyd, and many others. Fuerst does not recognize the sense by metonymy. The same change should perhaps also be made in ver. 12. See Exegesis. In the case of shutting up the leprous house (xiv. 38) the word *house* is distinctly expressed in the Heb.

[5] Ver. 6. כֵּהָה=*dim, pale, faint, weak, dying.* The idea is that of something in the process of fading away, disappearing. LXX. ἀμαυρὰ, Vulg. *obscurior.*

[6] Ver. 6. It does not appear why the conjunction in the A. V. should be printed in italics; it is, however wanting in 18 MSS., the Sam., and LXX.

[7] Ver. 9. The conjunction is wanting in the Heb., but is supplied in the Sam. and versions.

[8] Vers. 10 and 24. מִחְיָה, according to Rosenmueller and Fuerst *an indication*, and this is the sense given in Targ., Onk. and the Syr., and apparently also in the Vulg. The LXX. renders ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑγιοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς τῆς ζώσης ἐν τῇ οὐλῇ,

skin, and it have turned[3] the hair white, and *there be* quick [a mark of[8]] raw flesh
11 in the rising; it *is* an old leprosy in the skin of his flesh, and the priest shall pronounce him unclean, and shall not shut him up [bind it up[4]]: for he *is* unclean.
12 And if a leprosy break out abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of *him that hath* the plague [spot[1]] from his head even to his foot, wheresoever
13 the priest looketh; then the priest shall consider: and, behold, *if* the leprosy have covered all his flesh, he shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague [pronounce
14 the spot[1] clean[4]]: it [he[9]] is all turned white: he *is* clean. But when raw flesh
15 appeareth in him, he shall be unclean. And the priest shall see the raw flesh, and
16 pronounce him to be unclean: *for* the raw flesh *is* unclean: it *is* a leprosy. Or if the raw flesh turn [change[10]] again, and be changed [be turned[10]] unto white, he
17 shall come unto the priest; and the priest shall see him: and, behold, *if* the plague [spot[1]] be turned into [unto[11]] white; then the priest shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague [pronounce the spot[1] clean[4]]: he *is* clean.
18 The flesh also, in which,[12] *even* in the skin thereof, was a boil,[14] and is healed,
19 and in the place of the boil[14] there be a white rising, or a bright spot, white, and
20 somewhat reddish [and glistening[13]], and it be shewed to the priest; and if, when the priest seeth it, behold, it *be* in sight lower than the skin, and the hair thereof be turned white; the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it *is* a plague [spot[1]] of
21 leprosy broken out of the boil.[14] But if the priest look on it, and, behold, *there be* no white hairs therein, and *if* it *be* not lower than the skin, but *be* somewhat dark
22 [faint[5]]; then the priest shall shut him up [shall bind it up[4]] seven days: and if it spread much abroad in the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him unclean:
23 it *is* a plague [spot[1]]. But if the bright spot stay in his place, *and* spread not, it *is* a burning boil [a scar of the boil[15]]; and the priest shall pronounce him clean.
24 Or if there be *any* flesh, in the skin whereof *there is* a hot burning [a burn by fire[16]], and the quick *flesh* that burneth [the mark of the burn[8]] have a white bright
25 spot, somewhat reddish [glistening[13]], or white: then the priest shall look upon it: and, behold, *if* the hair in the bright spot be turned white, and it *be in* sight deeper than the skin; it *is* a leprosy broken out of the burning: wherefore the priest shall
26 pronounce him unclean: it *is* the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy. But if the priest look on it, and, behold, *there be* no white hair in the bright spot, and it *be* no lower than the *other* [*omit other*] skin, but *be* somewhat dark [faint[5]]; then the priest shall
27 shut him up [shall bind it up[4]] seven days: and the priest shall look upon him the seventh day; *and* if it be spread much abroad in the skin, then the priest shall
28 pronounce him unclean: it *is* the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy. And if the bright spot stay in his place, *and* spread not in the skin, but it *be* somewhat dark [faint[5]]: it *is* a rising of the burning, and the priest shall pronounce him clean: for it *is* an inflammation [a scar[15]] of the burning.

taking the כ as a preposition, and understanding it, as the Rabbins, of a spot of proud flesh in the midst of the cicatrice. The margin of the A. V. is *the quickening of living flesh; scar* would express the sense, but this is appropriated to צָרֶבֶת, vers. 23, 28, and *mark* gives the exact rendering of the Hebrew, and meets the requirements of the context.

[9] Ver. 13. The pronoun should obviously refer to the man rather than the spot.

[10] Ver. 16. נָהַפְךְ. This being the same verb as is used in vers. 3, 4, 17, in the same sense, the rendering should certainly be the same. The alteration in the A. V. was evidently on account of the previous translation of שׁוּב by *turn*. It is better to put the new word there.

[11] Ver. 17. The preposition is the same as in the previous verse, and the change in the A. V. may have been simply accidental.

[12] Ver. 18. The word בּוֹ seems redundant, and is wanting in 4 MSS. and the Sam.

[13] Ver. 19. אַדַמְדֶּמֶת. The reduplication of the letters in Heb. always intensifies the meaning (see Bochart, *Hieroz.* Pt. II., lib. V., c. vi., Ed. Rosen. III., p. 612 ss.); if therefore this be translated *red* at all, it must be *very red*, which would be inconsistent with the previous *white*. This obvious inconsistency has led the ancient versions into translations represented by the *somewhat reddish* of the A. V., and frequently to rendering the previous conjunction *or*. But as there is no conjunction at all in the Heb., it seems better to follow the suggestion of Pool, Patrick and others, and understand the word as meaning *very bright, shining, glistening*. Comp. the description of leprosy, Ex. iv. 6; Num. xii. 10; 2 Kings v. 27.

[14] Vers. 18 (*bis*), 20, 23. שְׁחִין, *burning ulcer*, would perhaps be a better, because a more general word; but *boil* was probably understood with sufficient latitude.

[15] Vers. 23 and 28. צָרֶבֶת הַשְּׁחִין, צ׳ הַמַּכָּוָה, Rosenmueller, *cicatrix ulceris*. So all the ancient versions, and so Gesenius. So also Coverdale and Cranmer, and so Rigg. Fuerst, however, *inflammation*.

[16] Ver. 24. The margin of the A. V. is better than the text. This paragraph (vers. 24–28) is plainly in relation to leprosy developing from a burn on the skin. So Gesen, Fuerst, Pool, Patrick, *etc.* So the LXX. and Vulg.

29, 30 If a man or woman have a plague [spot[1]] upon the head or the beard; then
the priest shall see the plague [spot[1]]: and, behold, if it *be* in sight deeper than the
skin; *and there be* in it a [*omit* a] yellow thin hair; then the priest shall pronounce
31 him unclean: it *is* a dry scall, *even* a leprosy upon the head or beard. And if the
priest look on the plague [spot[1]] of the scall, and, behold, it *be* not in sight deeper
than the skin, and *that there is* no black[17] hair in it; then the priest shall shut up
him that hath the plague of the scall [shall bind up[4] the spot[1] of the scall] seven
32 days: and in the seventh day the priest shall look on the plague[18] [spot]: and, be-
hold, *if* the scall spread not, and there be in it no yellow hair, and the scall *be* not in
33 sight deeper than the skin; he shall be shaven, but the scall shall he not shave;
and the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the scall [shall bind up the scall[4]] seven
34 days more: and in the seventh day the priest shall look on the scall: and, behold,
if the scall be not spread in the skin, nor *be* in sight deeper than the skin; then
the priest shall pronounce him clean: and he shall wash his clothes, and be clean.
35, 36 But if the scall spread much in the skin after his cleansing; then the priest
shall look on him: and, behold, if the scall be spread in the skin, the priest shall
37 not seek for yellow hair; he *is* unclean. But if the scall be in his sight at a stay
and *that* there is black hair grown up therein; the scall is healed, he *is* clean: and
the priest shall pronounce him clean.
38 If a man also or a woman have in the skin of their flesh bright spots, *even* white
39 bright spots; then the priest shall look: and, behold, *if* the bright spots in the
skin of their flesh *be* darkish [faint[5]] white; it *is* a freckled spot[19] *that* groweth in
the skin; he *is* clean.
40 And the man whose hair is fallen off his head, he *is* bald;[20] *yet is* he clean.
41 And he that hath his hair fallen off from the part of his head toward his face, he
42 *is* forehead bald: *yet is* he clean. And if there be in the bald head, or bald fore-
head, a white reddish sore [glistening[13] spot[1]]; it *is* a leprosy sprung up in his bald
43 head, or his bald forehead. Then the priest shall look upon it: and, behold, *if*
the rising of the sore [spot[1]] *be* white reddish [glistening[13]] in his bald head, or in
44 his bald forehead, as the leprosy appeareth in the skin of the flesh; he is a leprous
man, he *is* unclean: the priest shall pronounce him utterly unclean; his plague
[spot[1]] *is* in his head.
45 And the leper in whom the plague [spot[1]] *is*, his clothes shall be rent, and his
head bare,[21] and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip [his mouth[22]], and shall
46 cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague [spot[1]] *shall be* in him he
shall be defiled: he *is* unclean: he shall dwell alone [apart[23]]; without the camp
shall his habitation *be*.

B.—LEPROSY IN CLOTHING AND LEATHER.

Chapter XIII. 47–59.

47 The garment also that the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy is in, *whether it be* a woollen
48 garment, or a linen garment; whether *it be* in the warp, or woof; of linen, or of

[17] Ver. 31. The meaning of שָׁחֹר=*black* is established. The LXX., *yellow*, can therefore only be considered as an emendation of the text, substituting צָהֹב, and this is followed by Luther, Knobel, Keil, Murphy and others; it is, however, sustained by no other ancient version nor by any MS., and the change in the LXX. must be considered as simply an effort to avoid a difficulty. Keil and Clark propose, as a less desirable alternative, the omission of the negative particle. There is, however, no real difficulty in the text as it stands. See Exegesis.

[18] Ver. 32. The Sam. here substitutes נֶתֶק, *scall*, for נֶגַע, *spot*.

[19] Ver. 39. בֹּהַק, a word ἅπ. λεγ. according to Gesen. a harmless eruption of a whitish color which appears on the dark skin of the Arabs, and is still called by the same name.

[20] Ver. 40. קָרְחָ, used here apparently for the *back* of the head in contradistinction to גַּבָּחַ, *the front*, which occurs only here (but its derivative, גַּבַּחַת, is found vers. 42 *bis*, 43 and 55). קָרְחָ, however, is elsewhere baldness in general. Comp. Deut. xiv. 1.

[21] Ver. 45. Comp. Textual Note [5] on x. 6.

[22] Ver. 45. שָׂפָם. There is some doubt as to the true meaning. It is translated *beard* in the A. V., 2 Sam. xix. 24 (25), and so Fuerst and Gesenius would render it here, guided by the etymology. All the ancient versions, however, translate it either *mouth* or *lips*, and a word etymologically signifying *beard* (or rather the *sprouting place of hair*) would easily come to have this sense in use. It is a different word from the זָקָן=*beard* of ver. 29.

[23] Ver. 46. בָּדָד. The *alone* of the A. V. would ordinarily be a good enough translation, but is liable to be misunderstood. The leper was simply to dwell apart from the clean Israelites, but might and did live with other lepers.

49 woollen; whether in a skin, or in anything made of skin; and if the plague [spot[1]]
be greenish or reddish [very green or very red[24]] in the garment, or in the skin,
either in the warp, or in the woof, or in anything of skin; it *is* a plague [spot[1]] of
50 leprosy, and shall be shewed unto the priest: and the priest shall look upon the
plague, and shut up *it that hath* the plague [spot,[1] and bind up[4] the spot[1]] seven
51 days: and he shall look on the plague [spot[1]] on the seventh day: if the plague
[spot[1]] be spread in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in a skin,
or in any work that is made of skin; the plague [spot[1]] *is* a fretting leprosy; it *is*
52 unclean. He shall therefore burn that garment, whether warp or woof, in woollen
or in linen, or anything of skin, wherein the plague [spot[1]] is: for it *is* a fretting
53 leprosy; it shall be burnt in the fire. And if the priest shall look, and, behold,
the plague [spot[1]] be not spread in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof,
54 or in anything of skin; then the priest shall command that they wash *the thing*
55 wherein the plague [spot[1]] *is*, and he shall shut [bind[4]] it up seven days more: and
the priest shall look on the plague [spot[1]], after that it is washed: and, behold, *if*
the plague [spot[1]] have not changed his color, and the plague [spot[1]] be not spread;
it *is* unclean; thou shalt burn it in the fire; it *is* fret inward, *whether* it *be* bare
56 within or without.[25] And if the priest look, and, behold, the plague *be* somewhat
dark [the spot[1] *be* somewhat faint[5]] after the washing of it; then he shall rend it
57 out of the garment, or out of the skin, or out of the warp, or out of the woof: and
if it appear still in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in anything
of skin; it *is* a spreading *plague* [*omit* a *and plague*]; thou shalt burn that wherein
58 the plague [spot[1]] *is*, with fire. And the garment, either warp, or woof, or what-
soever thing of skin *it be*, which thou shalt wash, if the plague [spot[1]] be departed
from them, then it shall be washed the second time, and shall be clean.
59 This *is* the law of the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy in a garment of woollen or linen,
either in the warp, or woof, or anything of skins, to pronounce it clean, or to pro-
nounce it unclean.

C.—CLEANSING AND RESTORATION OF A LEPER.

Chapter XIV. 1–32.

1, 2 And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, This shall be the law of the
3 leper in the day of his cleansing: He shall be brought unto the priest: and
the priest shall go forth out of the camp; and the priest shall look, and, behold, *if*
4 the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy be healed in the leper; then shall the priest command
to take[26] for him that is to be cleansed two birds[27] alive *and* clean, and cedar wood
5 and scarlet, and hyssop: and the priest shall command that one of the birds be
6 killed in an earthen vessel over running [living[28]] water: as for[29] the living bird,
he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip
them and the living bird in the blood of the bird *that was* killed over the running
7 [living[28]] water: and he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the
leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird
8 loose into the open fields. And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes,
and shave off all his hair, and wash [bathe[30]] himself in water, that he may be

[24] Ver. 49. יְרַקְרַק. The reduplication of the letters intensifies the meaning. Comp. note [13] on ver. 19. אַדְמְדֶמֶת, too, as noted above, may here mean either *very red*, or, as before, *glistening*. There is so little knowledge about the fact that neither of them can be certainly decided upon; but as in this case we have the disjunctive (as also in xiv. 37), it seems more probable that two distinct colors were intended.

[25] Ver. 55. The margin of the A. V. gives the literal rendering of the Heb. *bald in the head thereof, or in the forehead thereof*, and there can be no doubt that these are terms figuratively applied to the cloth or skin for the right and wrong side, as in the text.

[26] Chap. XIV. Ver. 4. The Sam., LXX. and Syr. here read the verb in the plural, expressing the fulfillment of the command.

[27] Ver. 4. The margin of the A. V. reads *sparrows*, for which there seems to be no other authority than the Vulg. The Heb. does not define the kind of bird at all.

[28] Ver. 5. Better, *living water*, which is the exact rendering of the Heb. Ordinarily *living water* is a figure for running water; but here the water is contained in a vessel, and had therefore simply been filled from a spring or running stream.

[29] Ver. 6. אֶת. The conjunction which seems to be needed at the beginning of this verse is supplied in the Sam. and 6 MSS. There is nothing in Heb. answering to the *as for* of the A. V.

[30] Ver. 8. רָחַץ is applied only to the washing of the surface of objects which water will not penetrate. Comp. i. 9, 13; ix. 14, *etc.* It is a different word from כָּבַס of the previous clause, which is used of a more thorough washing or *full-*

clean: and after that he shall come into the camp, and shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days.

9 But it shall be on the seventh day, that he shall shave all his hair off his head and his beard and his eyebrows, even all his hair he shall shave off: and he shall wash his clothes, also he shall wash [bathe[30]] his flesh in water, and he shall be clean.

10 And on the eighth day he shall take two he lambs [two young rams[31]] without blemish, and one ewe lamb of the first year without blemish, and three tenth deals of fine flour *for* a meat offering [an oblation[32]], mingled with oil, and one log of oil.

11 And the priest that maketh *him* clean shall present the man that is to be made clean, and those things, before the LORD, *at* the door of the tabernacle of the con-

12 gregation: and the priest shall take one he lamb [ram[31]], and offer him for a trespass offering, and the log of oil, and wave them *for* a wave offering before the LORD:

13 and he[33] shall slay the lamb [ram[31]] in the place where he[33] shall kill the sin offering and the burnt offering, in the holy place: for as the sin offering *is* the priest's,

14 *so is*[34] the trespass offering: it *is* most holy: and the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the trespass offering, and the priest shall put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon

15 the great toe of his right foot: and the priest shall take *some* of the log of oil, and

16 pour *it* into the palm of his own left hand: and the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that *is* in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven

17 times before the LORD: and of the rest of the oil that *is* in his hand shall the priest put upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the blood[35] of the

18 trespass offering: and the remnant of[36] the oil that *is* in the priest's hand he shall pour [put[37]] upon the head of him that is to be cleansed: and the priest shall make

19 an atonement for him before the LORD. And the priest shall offer the sin offering, and make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed from his uncleanness; and

20 afterward he shall kill the burnt offering: and the priest shall offer the burnt offering and the meat offering [oblation[32]] upon the altar:[38] and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and he shall be clean.

21 And if he *be* poor, and cannot get so much: then he shall take one lamb [ram[31]] *for* a trespass offering to be waved, to make an atonement for him, and one tenth

22 deal of fine flour mingled with oil for a meat offering, and a log of oil; and two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get; and the one shall be

23 a sin offering, and the other a burnt offering. And he shall bring them on the eighth day for [of[39]] his cleansing unto the priest, unto the door of the tabernacle

24 of the congregation, before the LORD. And the priest shall take the lamb [ram[31]] of the trespass offering, and the log of oil, and the priest shall wave them *for* a

25 wave offering before the LORD: and he shall kill the lamb [ram[31]] of the trespass offering, and the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the trespass offering, and put *it* upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the

ing. The English is unable in all cases to preserve the distinction; but it should be done as far as possible, and רָחַץ is frequently translated *bathe* in the following chapter (xv. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 18, 21, 22, 27) and elsewhere.

[31] Ver. 10. שְׁנֵי־כְבָשִׂים. See Textual Note [5] on iii. 7. The age is not exactly specified in the Heb.; but the Sam. and LXX. add *of the first year*, as in the following clause.

[32] Ver. 10. See Textual Note [2] on ii. 1.

[33] Ver. 12. The Sam. and LXX. have the plural. Probably the sing. of the Heb. is not intended to have the priest for its nominative, but to be impersonal.

[34] Ver. 13. One MS., the Sam, LXX. and Vulg. supply the particle of comparison, כְּ.

[35] Ver. 17. Two MSS., the LXX. and Vulg. here read, as the Heb. in ver. 28, *upon the place of the blood*.

[36] Ver 18. For בַּשֶּׁמֶן three MSS. and the Syr. read מִן־הַשֶּׁמֶן, as in ver. 16. On this use of בְּ, however, see Fuerst, Lex. בְּ, 3, *b*. γ. Gesen. Lex. A. 2.

[37] Ver. 18. יִתֵּן is better translated *put*, both as more agreeable to the meaning of the word itself, and because the oil remaining in the left hand could hardly suffice for *pouring*.

[38] Ver. 20. The Sam. and LXX. add *before the Lord*.

[39] Ver. 23. The preposition is here so liable to be misunderstood that it is better to change it. It has reference to the eighth day appointed for his cleansing (as the Vulg.), not to the sacrifices for his cleansing (as the LXX). So Geddes and Boothroyd. In ver. 10 the difficulty does not occur.

26 thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot: and the priest
27 shall pour of the oil into the palm of his own[40] left hand: and the priest shall
sprinkle with his right finger *some* of the oil that *is* in his left hand seven times
28 before the LORD: and the priest shall put of the oil that *is* in his hand upon the
tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right
hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot, upon the place of the blood of the
29 trespass offering: and the rest of[41] the oil that *is* in the priest's hand he shall put
upon the head of him that is to be cleansed, to make an atonement for him before
30 the LORD. And he shall offer the one of the turtle doves, or of the young pigeons,
31 such as he can get; *even* such as he is able to get, the one *for* a sin offering, and
the other *for* a burnt offering, with the meat offering: and the priest shall make
an atonement for him that is to be cleansed before the LORD.
32 This *is* the law *of him* in whom *is* the plague [spot[1]] of leprosy, whose hand is
not able to get *that which pertaineth* to his cleansing.

D.—LEPROSY IN A HOUSE.

CHAPTER XIV. 33–53.

33, 34 And the LORD spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, When ye be come
into the land of Canaan, which I give to you for a possession, and I put the plague
35 [spot[1]] of leprosy in a house of the land of your possession; and he that owneth
the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, It seemeth to me *there is* as it were
36 a plague [spot[1]] in the house: then the priest shall command that they empty the
house, before the priest go *into it* to see the plague [spot[1]], that all that *is* in the
house be not made unclean: and afterward the priest shall go in to see the house:
37 and he shall look on the plague [spot[1]], and, behold, *if* the plague [spot[1]] *be* in the
walls of the house with hollow strakes,[42] greenish or reddish [very green or very
38 red[43]], which in sight *are* lower than the wall; then the priest shall go out of the
39 house to the door of the house, and shut up the house seven days: and the priest
shall come again the seventh day, and shall look: and, behold, *if* the plague [spot[1]]
40 be spread in the walls of the house; then the priest shall command that they take
away the stones in which the plague [spot[1]] *is*, and they shall cast them into an
41 unclean place without the city: and he[44] shall cause the house to be scraped within
round about, and they shall pour out the dust that they scrape off without the city
42 into an unclean place: and they shall take other stones, and put *them* in the place
of those stones; and he[44] shall take other mortar, and shall plaister the house.
43 And if the plague [spot[1]] come again, and break out in the house, after that he[44]
hath taken away the stones, and after he hath scraped the house, and after it is
44 plaistered; then the priest shall come and look, and, behold, *if* the plague [spot[1]]
45 be spread in the house, it *is* a fretting leprosy in the house: it *is* unclean. And
he[44] shall break down the house, the stones of it, and the timber thereof, and all
the mortar of the house; and he[44] shall carry *them* forth out of the city into an
46 unclean place. Moreover he that goeth into the house all the while that it is shut
47 up shall be unclean until the even. And he that lieth in the house shall wash his
clothes; and he that eateth in the house shall wash his clothes.[45]
48 And if the priest shall come in, and look *upon it*, and, behold, the plague [spot[1]]
hath not spread in the house, after the house was plaistered: then the priest shall
49 pronounce the house clean, because the plague [spot[1]] is healed. And he shall take
50 to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: and he

[40] Ver. 26. עַל־כַּף הַכֹּהֵן, an expression understood by Houbigant to mean that one priest should pour into the hand of another; the sense given in the A. V. following the Vulg. is, however, doubtless correct.

[41] Ver. 29. The Sam. here reverses its change of reading in ver. 18, and has בְּ for מִן.

[42] Ver. 36. שְׁקַעֲרוּרֹת, a word ἅπ. λέγ., but its meaning sufficiently well ascertained. The A. V. follows the LXX., Chald. and Vulg., and the same sense is given by Rosenm., Fuerst and Gesen, though by each with a different etymology.

[43] Ver. 37. See Notes [13] on xiii. 19, and [24] on ver. 49.

[44] Ver. 41. All the ancient versions except the Vulg. change the causative form of the verb to the plural, as the following verb is plural. Also in vers. 42, 43, 45, 49, they have the plural.

[45] Ver. 47. The LXX. here adds, what is of course implied, *and be unclean until the even.*

51 shall kill the one of the birds in an earthen vessel over running water: and he shall
take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and the living bird, and dip
them in the blood of the slain bird, and[46] in the running [living[28]] water, and sprin-
52 kle the house seven times: and he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird,
and with the running [living[28]] water, and with the living bird, and with the cedar
53 wood, and with the hyssop, and with the scarlet: but he shall let go the living bird
out of the city into the open fields, and make an atonement for the house: and it
shall be clean.

E. — CONCLUSION.

CHAP. XIV. 54–57.

54, 55 This *is* the law for all manner of plague [spot'] of leprosy, and scall, and for
56 the leprosy of a garment, and of a house, and for a rising, and for a scab, and for a
57 bright spot: to teach when *it is* unclean, and when *it is* clean: this *is* the law of
leprosy.

[46] Ver. 51. The LXX. has *dip them in the blood of the bird that has been killed over the living water*, and this is doubtless the sense of the text.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

A. The Examination and its result.

The indications of the disease. Vers. 1–8.

Ver. 1. This communication is addressed to Moses and Aaron conjointly because it requires examinations and determinations entrusted to the priests.

Vers. 2–8. The first case, of symptoms like leprosy. Ver. 2. **Man** is of course used generically for a person of either sex. No stress is to be laid upon the fact that the expression **skin of his flesh** is found only in this chapter; for the word **skin** occurs here nearly as often as in all the rest of the Scripture put together, and very similar expressions do occur elsewhere, *e. g.* Ex. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35, "the skin of his face," and the skin is often spoken of as covering the flesh, *e. g.* Ezek. xxxvii. 6, 8, *etc.*—**A rising, a scab, or a bright spot,** are different indications of incipient leprosy; the disease itself was more deeply seated, but it betrayed itself, as it does still, by these marks. The last two terms are only used in connection with this disease, and the first is only elsewhere used figuratively of dignity or excellency. "The name **leprosy** צָרַעַת is derived from צָרַע = *to strike down, to strike to the ground:* the leper is he who has been smitten by God." Lange. For the examination of the leper one of the ordinary priests was sufficient as well as the high-priest; the Talmudists assert that priests debarred by physical imperfection from ministering at the altar were competent to the examination of lepers. The priests were expected, if occasion required, to consult with experts, but the formal sentence rested with them alone.

Ver. 3. These marks, however, might exist without having been caused by leprosy. Two distinguishing characteristics are now mentioned, and if both these concurred, there could be no doubt about the case—the priest was at once to **pronounce him unclean**; (a) if the hair growing upon the spot had turned white. The hair of the Israelites was normally black; if it had **turned white** upon the spot it betrayed a cause at work beneath the surface of the skin. (b) If the spot was in appearance **deeper than the skin.** "These signs are recognized by modern observers (*e. g.* Hensler); and among the Arabs leprosy is regarded as curable if the hair remains black upon the white spots, but incurable if it becomes whitish in color." Keil. Judgment was of course required in the application of the second test; but if the indications were clear, the case was decided, and the duty of the priest was to declare the existing fact.

Vers. 4–8. The determination of cases in which the indications are not decisive. First, vers. 4-6, the case in which the suspicion of leprosy should prove unfounded. If there were suspicious looking spots, but yet they appeared on examination to be merely superficial, and there was no change in the color of the hair growing in them, either of two things might be possible: the spots might be the effect of true leprosy not yet sufficiently developed to give decisive indications; or they might be a mere eruption upon the skin, of no importance. To ascertain which of these was the fact, the priest was to **bind up the spot seven days.**—At the end of that time a second examination was to be made; if then the indications were favorable, the same process was to be repeated. If at the end of this time the indications were still favorable, and especially if the suspicious spot had become **faint,** tending to disappear, the priest was to pronounce the man clean. Yet still the very suspicion, unfounded as it proved to be, had brought some semblance of a taint upon the man, and he must **wash his clothes.** These two periods of seven days each are usually looked upon as periods of a sort of quarantine, during which the man himself was to be secluded, and this view has been incorporated into the A. V. here and throughout these chapters. It is not, however, required by the Hebrew, and in view of the great hardship it would impose upon those who were in reality entirely free from the disease, it seems more likely that the simple rendering of the Hebrew gives the true sense. The extreme slowness with which leprosy is oftentimes developed has been considered a difficulty in the way of a determination in reality, in so short a time;

however, the two things are not at all incompatible. A fortnight was quite long enough to determine the character of any ordinary eruption; if it was none of these, and yet possessed the characteristics of leprosy, then it must be decided to be leprosy, although months or years might pass before the disease showed much further progress. Vers. 7, 8, however, show that even the leprous spots themselves did not remain quite unchanged during this time. On the second examination the priest could ascertain if the spots had begun to spread. If not, the disease, although it might possibly already exist, was not pronounced; but if they had spread, all doubt was at an end; **the priest shall pronounce him unclean.** Another view is taken of ver. 7. Rosenmüller says that in the word לְטָהֳרָתוֹ the ל is to be taken for *postquam* as in Ex. xix. 1; Num. i. 1; 1 Kings iii. 18; this sense is followed in the Vulg. and Luther, and adopted by Vatablus, Patrick, and other commentators. According to this the law would relate to the breaking out of the leprosy afresh at some time after he had been pronounced clean by the priest. The translation of the A. V., however, which is here followed, seems more exactly the sense of the Hebrew.

Vers. 9–11. The second case is one in which ulceration has already begun. Either it is a long-standing case in which the command for inspection has been neglected, or else one in which sentence of cleanness has been pronounced on insufficient grounds. With the appearance **of a mark of raw flesh in the rising,** in combination with the other indications, all doubt was removed; it must be **an old leprosy,** and the priest shall at once **pronounce him unclean.**

Vers. 12–17. The third case is looked upon according to differing medical views, either as a different disease, the *lepra vulgaris,* which "scarcely affects the general health, and for the most part disappears of itself, though it often lasts for years" (Clark); or as a case of the true leprosy in which "the breaking out of the leprous matter in this complete and rapid way upon the surface of the whole body was the crisis of the disease; the diseased matter turned into a scurf, which died away and then fell off" (Keil). Patrick compares it to the eruptions in measles and small pox, when there is safety in their full development. The suspected person thus either had a harmless disease, or he had had the leprosy and was cured. In either case sentence of cleanness was to be pronounced. But (vers. 14, 15) if ulceration appeared (it would seem either at the moment or afterwards) he was at once to be declared unclean. This ulceration, however, might proceed from some other cause; therefore, although the man must be declared unclean in view of so suspicious an indication, yet if it afterwards passed away, the sentence might be reversed, and the man pronounced clean without further investigation.

Vers. 18–23. The fourth case is that of a suspected leprosy arising from an abscess or boil which had been healed. Such disturbed conditions of the surface were peculiarly apt to become the seat of disease. The indications are much the same as in the other cases, the terms first mentioned here being equally applicable to the others. Reliance is again placed (ver. 20) upon the depth of the spot and the change in the color of the hair. If these indications were clear, as in ver. 3, the priest should at once pronounce the man unclean; if they were doubtful, he was to proceed as in ver. 4, and be guided by the result of a second examination at the end of seven days. In such a case a single interval of a week appears to have been sufficient, and no further examination is provided for. After one week it could be certainly determined whether it was merely the scar of the ulcer, or whether leprosy had really broken out in it.

Vers. 24–28. The fifth case is that of suspected leprosy developing from a burn, another of those injuries favorable for the development of the disease. The indications and the procedure are precisely the same as before. In ver. 26 the A. V. has inserted the word *other* unfortunately.

Vers. 29–37. The case of leprosy suspected in an eruption upon the hairy part of the head, or upon the beard. Although this is spoken expressly in regard to both men and women, yet the indications are so dependent upon hair that it is not proper to substitute here *chin* for *beard,* as is done by Keil. The word used זָקָן is a different one from the שָׂפָם of ver. 45, which is often translated *beard;* the Ancient Versions, however, give *beard* here, and either *mouth* or *lips* there. Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* lib. xxvi. 1) speaks of such a disease imported into Italy from Asia in the reign of Tiberius, neither painful nor fatal, "yet any death preferable to it." In ver. 30 the A. V. has unnecessarily modified the symptoms by inserting the indefinite article before **yellow thin hair.** The word שֵׂעָר is collective, as in ver. 3, and freq. In this form of the disease the natural hair seems to have been supplanted by **thin, yellow** (צָהֹב = *golden,* shining) **hair.** This is declared to be נָתָק, translated in the A. V. **dry scall,** and immediately explained as **a leprosy upon the head or beard.** The word occurs only in these chapters. The indications given in vers. 29, 30, were not absolutely decisive. It would seem from ver. 31, that in the coming on of true leprosy the effect upon the hair was only gradually produced, part of the hair remaining for a time of its natural color; while in the case of other harmless cutaneous eruptions, of more rapid progress, all the hair on the affected spot was speedily changed. Hence the entire absence of **black hair** at the first was a favorable symptom. In this view the text is consistent enough with itself as it stands, and Keil is wrong in saying "there is certainly an error in the text." In case of this favorable symptom the priest should bind up the spot for two periods of a week, making a further examination at the end of each of them. The favorable indications were that the spot did not spread, did not appear to be deep-seated, and the yellow hair disappeared. If this was the case at the end of the first period, the person was to be shaven with the exception of the spot, and at the end of the second pronounced clean, and **to wash his clothes.**—If, however, (vers. 35, 36)

the trouble afterwards spread, the person was to be again examined by the priest, and being satisfied of this single fact, the priest must pronounce him unclean. Yet if this spreading was only temporary, he might finally be pronounced clean (ver. 37) provided the natural hair grew again in the spot.

Vers. 38, 39. This is the case of a harmless eruption in the skin termed בֹּהַק, LXX. *ἀλφός*. It is still known among the Arabs and called by the same name, *bohak*. "It is an eruption upon the skin, appearing in somewhat elevated spots or rings of unequal sizes and a pale white color, which do not change the hair; it causes no inconvenience, and lasts from two months to two years." Keil. It is placed here, because it might be, without proper examination, mistaken for leprosy, and its appearance was probably most nearly assimilated to the symptoms last mentioned. The sufferer by it was at once discharged as clean, without further ceremony.

Vers. 40–44. The baldness of the head, whether on the front or back, constitutes no uncleanness; yet leprosy might be developed in the bald parts, and then was to be dealt with as in other cases. The reason for speaking of baldness at all in this connection is probably that the color of the hair has been made of so much importance in determining the symptoms of leprosy, that the legislator would cut off all opportunity for cavil in suspected cases.

Vers. 45, 46. The law for the pronounced leper. The leper was in the first place to put on the signs of mourning (comp. Ezek. xxiv. 17, 22), some say "for himself as one over whom death had already gained the victory" (Clark); but it may have been merely as a mark of great affliction, and some of the signs were also signs of shame (comp. Mic. iii. 7). **And shall cry, Unclean, unclean,** as a warning to any passers by. This command is not, as sometimes asserted, to guard against the danger of communicating the disease; but rather to avoid making others ceremonially unclean by contact with a leper. The Rabbins carried this sort of defilement so far as to assert that "by merely entering a house, a leper polluted everything without it." (*Mishna*, Kelim i. 4; Negaim xiii. 11, as cited by Keil). **All the days.**—The law constantly keeps in view the possibility of the recovery of the leper; but it is uncertain whether this indicates that the true leprosy was then less incurable than now, or whether it has regard to the possibility of error in the determination of the disease. In either case, while the symptoms continued for which he had been pronounced unclean, and until by the same authority he was again formally declared clean (xiv. 1–32), he was to **dwell apart; without the camp.** Comp. Num. v. 2–4; xii. 14, 15; 2 Ki. xv. 5; Lk. xvii. 12. The Jews say that there were three camps from all of which the leper was excluded: that of God (the tabernacle), that of the Levites, and that of Israel. After the settlement in the Holy Land the camp was considered in this, as in other commands, to be represented by the walled city. Yet after the erection of synagogues lepers were allowed to enter a particular part of them set apart for their use, (Mishna *ubi supra*).

B. Leprosy in clothing and Leather, xiii. 47–59.

Only three materials for clothing are here mentioned: wool, linen, and skins. The two former were the usual materials among the ancient Egyptians and Greeks, and only these are mentioned Deut. xxii. 11; Prov. xxxi. 13; Hos. ii. 9. It is a dispute among the Talmudists whether garments of camel's hair are included or not. Woolen and linen were forbidden by the law (xix. 19) to be mixed in the same garment. On the nature of the leprosy here described, see the preliminary note to this chapter. Ver. 48. **Whether it be in the warp or woof** has occasioned much unnecessary perplexity on account of the supposed difficulty in one of these remaining unaffected in the cloth by any disintegration occurring in the other; and Keil would translate "*the flax and the wool;*" Clark, De Wette, Knobel and others, (with whom Keil also seems to concur) explain it of *yarn prepared for warp* and *yarn prepared for woof.* There is really however, no difficulty in the matter, if the trouble is supposed to arise from some original fault in the material or in the processes of its preparation. Whichever was made of such material would first show the defect, and it could be seen in the cloth that the trouble arose from either the warp or the woof, as the case might be. The same sort of thing is sometimes observed in cloth now when the proper proportion has not been observed between the strength of the two kinds of thread, so that the cloth will tear with undue ease in one direction but not in the other; or when, in cloth woven of different colors, one set of threads has been injured in the dyeing. A distinction is made between **a skin** and **any thing made of skin.** The former were whole skins, as sheep skins dressed with the wool on for a sort of cloak for the poor, or for mats, *etc.*, and also made into leather for bottles and other uses; the latter the endless variety of smaller articles made of leather. Ver. 49. A strong green or red spot was *prima facie* evidence of leprosy, and subjected that in which it appeared to priestly examination. According to Maimonides (cited by Patrick) the spot must be "as broad as a bean," and if smaller than this was of no consequence. Ver. 50. **Bind up the spot.**—Here as in ver. 4, *etc.*, the usual interpretation is that of the A. V., *shut up it that hath the spot;* but the Hebrew in all these places only means necessarily the binding up of the spot itself, not a sort of quarantine upon the person or thing on which it is. See Textual note 4. In this case there is not the same hardship involved in the other rendering as in the case of the human subject; but still the rendering is objectionable as implying much more strongly than the law itself the idea of contagiousness. Vers. 51-58 describe the appearances by which the priest must determine whether the suspicious spots were really leprosy or not. These turn upon whether the spot increased. If it did, then he was at once to **burn that garment.** The expresssion in vers. 52, and 58, **whether warp or woof,** and in ver. 56 **out of the warp or out of the woof** is to be understood of the cloth in which the disease has appeared in either the warp or the woof. **Fretting,** vers. 51, 52

(Bochart, *lepra exasperata*), is equivalent to *corroding*. If however, the spot had not increased at the examination made at the end of a week, the suspected article was to be washed and the process repeated. If at the end of another week after the washing there was no change in the color of the spot, the thing was to be condemned and burned, although there was no apparent spreading. In such case **it is fret inward**, *i. e.*, the material itself was faulty and unfit for use. **Whether it be bare within or without**; lit. bald in the head thereof, or in the forehead thereof, (Margin A. V. See Texual note 20). As the disease itself is figuratively named from its resemblance to the human leprosy, so these terms are used in the same way, and are generally considered to mean the right or the wrong side of the cloth or skin. On the other hand, if at the end of the week after the washing the spot had become less distinct (ver. 56), it was to be torn out of the garment or skin. If it reappeared (ver. 57) the thing was to be burned; but otherwise (ver. 58) to be washed a second time and then pronounced clean. Ver. 59 is simply the usual conclusion, stating that the foregoing is the law for the cases specified.

C. Cleansing and restoration of the leper, xiv. 1–32.

This communication was addressed to Moses alone, because there were no questions to be determined by priestly examination; it simply directs what is to be done in the case of a person already pronounced clean by the priest. Vers. 1–20 prescribe the normal course, vers. 21–31 allow certain modifications for the poor, and ver. 32 is the conclusion.

A new Proper Lesson of the law begins here, and extends to the close of the following chapter; the parallel lesson from the prophets is 2 Ki. vii. 3–20, containing the account brought into Samaria by the four lepers of the flight of the besieging army of the Syrians.

Lange: "*a.* The theocratico-political atonement, or the taking again of the person pronounced clean into the camp, *i. e.*, into the congregation of the people. Hence this first act of atonement took place without the camp (later, before the gate of the city). The leper was to be represented by two birds, living and clean. They must be wild birds, since the tame turtle doves or the young pigeons would not have flown away when released. Since these birds represent the maximum of free motion, we may certainly find this thought indicated: want of free motion was a chief cause of the leprosy." [This inference, however, it is to be remembered, is only an *inference*, not a part of the law which carefully abstains from any mention of the causes]. "One of these birds was slain over a vessel in which there was already some fresh spring or river water. It is not to be understood that in this the purification by water was indicated together with the atoning blood, since the washing follows farther on; on the contrary, in the fresh water the thought of living motion is again brought out. The blood of the slain bird dropped into this water; the few drops of blood, in and of themselves, would not suffice for the sprinkling. Nevertheless also, the blood of the slain bird considered as typically sick, through death became fresh again in its signification. The living bird, which was to remain alive, was dipped in the augmented blood of the dead bird. But very note-worthy are the allegorical accompaniments which jointly serve to illustrate the living bird, and were therefore dipped with it in the blood; a piece of cedar wood, as a symbol of *the endurance of life;* a piece of scarlet, as a symbol of *the freshness of life;* some hyssop, as a symbol of *the purity of life through constant purifications of life.*" (See Keil, p. 106, [trans., p. 385 *s.*]). After the living bird with these accompaniments had been dipped in the blood, the person to be cleansed was sprinkled seven times with this blood. No further mention is made of the dead bird, since its flesh was not a sacrifice; but the living bird, hallowed by the blood of the dead, is set free. We may rightly see in the two birds the double position of the leper in his leprosy: in the slain bird he appears as he had fallen into death; in the one that is set free, on the contrary, he appears as by God's mercy he is recovered to unrestrained motion. But we might also in this contrast find the thought, that the leprosy, as it falls upon one part of the community, keeps the other part all the more free; or, that health and disease are separated as opposite poles in regard to the common national life. In any case, it is a fact that, in regions where Cretinism prevails, which is analogous to leprosy, the freshest and strongest forms occur near the sick. Meanwhile, the person sprinkled with the blood must complete this purification in several ways: first, by washing his clothes; secondly, by cutting off all his hair from his whole body, (whether also his eyebrows and eyelashes?); thirdly, by bathing himself. Then he might go into the camp, but must yet add seven days more on the outside of his tent. Why? Keil answers with the Chaldee *et non accedat ad latus uxoris suæ.* But the law would not have been too modest to say so. With this is to be noticed that this same direction is applied to several analogous cases. He who is healed of a running issue, must wait seven days after the recognition of his healing before he can bring his sacrifice (xv. 13). The same applies to the woman with an issue of blood (*ib.* 28). So too, for the Nazarite in whose presence a man had died (Num. vi. 10). Particularly weighty is the direction of the seven days' waiting which, according to viii. 35, must introduce the final consecration of the priests. We cannot say that during these seven days the priest was yet unclean; but he had not indeed become fully clean for the service of the priesthood. When we look back at the ordinance of the second seven days in reference to one who has been recognized as clean—the leprous man, or garment, or house,—there appears a distinction of cleanness of a first and second grade, a negative and a positive cleanness, which latter was a kind of priestly consecration. Every Israelite, in his degree should have this priestly consecration; but especially near to it stood the Nazarite, and next to him we place the cleansed leper. In the new covenant, the highly favored sinner stands higher than the Christian of less experience of salvation; the son, who was lost and found, higher than the elder brother; Mary Magdalene

nigher than a common maiden." [It must be always borne in mind, however, that this superiority does not rest upon any advantage in having sinned, but upon the earnestness of love on the part of him who has been forgiven. See Lk. vii. 47. F. G.]. "This fact appears to have been typically represented in the Old Testament by the restoration of the cleansed leper to the worship of the congregation." [It was represented, that is to say, in the very full ceremonies and sacrifices accompanying the restoration, but not in any higher position of the cleansed leper after his restoration was accomplished.—F. G.].

"*b.* The theocratico-religious atonement. The offering obligatory upon the leper was very extensive; two he-lambs, one ewe-lamb, three tenth parts of wheaten flour mingled with oil, and a log of oil. The trespass offering formed the beginning of the offering, for the leper has by the connection with his people come into its guilt." [Nevertheless, it is hard to see how this could have been the reason, when the leper had been absolutely separated from his people, and was now to be restored to his connection with them. But see under ver. 12.—F. G.]. "The blood of this trespass offering was first treated like the blood of the trespass offering of the priest; it was put on the tip of the right ear, on the thumb of the right hand, and on the thumb or great toe of the right foot, all with the same meaning as in the consecration of the priests. In addition to this, the oil comes into use, which indeed, as being common oil, is different from the anointing oil of the priests, but is still a symbol of the spiritual life. With this oil in minute measure, the priest, with a finger of his right hand dipped in the oil which had been poured into the hollow of the left, executed a seven-fold sprinkling before the Lord, *i. e.*, towards the sanctuary. Then, with the rest of the oil, the three parts of the body were anointed which had been smeared with the blood of the trespass offering. The blood baptism preceded, as the negative consecration: the oil baptism must follow, as the positive atonement. The head of the leper was also anointed with the oil. He was thus to be made a man of the Spirit in each way, by his tribulation, and his deliverance. Then followed the sin offering, for which, in accordance with iv. 28, 32, the ewe-lamb was to be used. In this place the addition is made: he **shall make an atonement for him that is to be cleansed** [xiv. 31]. Plainly his sin is assumed in this to be individual guilt, in contradistinction from his share in the common guilt. It is rightly presupposed that the leprosy in each one stands in connection with his individual sinfulness; however light, it has for its result, sins of ill-will, of bitterness, of impatience, of self-forgetfulness, of prejudice toward the community. Now first can the presentation of the burnt offering follow, with the other he-lamb, and with the meat offering."

"The ordinance may be modified in case the person to be purified is poor. The direction for the sacrifice itself is indeed almost analogous to the direction in the case of the poor woman in child-birth; only here the lamb for the trespass offering, the tenth deal of wheaten flour sprinkled with oil for a meat offering, and the log of oil for anointing, could not be dispensed with by the bringing of two doves or young pigeons. Moreover, the trespass offering, as well as the oil, is directed to be made a wave-offering before Jehovah. It is the same ritual as the wave or the consecration offering at the consecration of the priests (viii. 22, 27). Thus this waving here also can only signify a peculiar consecration of the leper, which is more strongly expressed in the case of the poor leper who must be shaken free with his gift, must be brought to a swinging up, or heave offering (Aufschwung)."

Some points in the above will be found differently treated below.

Vers. 1–3. The starting point for the following directions is the priestly inspection of the leper supposed to be healed. This must take place without the camp, and if it resulted favorably, then the following directions were to be observed. (The expression נִרְפָּא מִן, as Keil notes, is a "*const. prægnans*, healed away from, *i. e.*, healed and gone away from").

Vers. 4–8. The restoration to the camp. This was formally accomplished by a very full and significant ritual, proportioned to the abhorrence in which leprosy was to be held, and the rigidness of the exclusion of the leper from the society of his people. There was no sacrifice, since the person to be cleansed was not yet in a condition to offer sacrifice, nor was anything offered, or even brought by him, nor was anything placed upon the altar. The ceremony was, however, a purification which is always related to sacrifice as a symbolic step towards a restoration to fellowship with God.

For the significance of the things used in this ceremony, Abarbanel is quoted by Patrick to the following effect: the *living birds* signify that the leper's dead flesh was restored to life and vigor; the *cedar wood* restoration from putrefaction; the *scarlet* (wool, or thread, or a bit of cloth) restoration of the color of health to the complexion; the *hyssop* (which was fragrant) restoration from the exceedingly ill odor of the disease.

An earthen vessel was taken—probably that after this use it might be broken up and destroyed—and partly filled with water from a spring or brook, and one of the birds killed over it in such a way that its blood should fall into and be mingled with the water. In this the living bird was to be dipped with the other things, and then the person to be cleansed was sprinkled with it with that sevenfold sprinkling prescribed on occasions of peculiar solemnity (see iv. 6); and the person was then to be pronounced clean. After this the living bird was let **loose into the open field.** In attempting to estimate the significance of this rite, it is to be remembered that precisely the same ritual is prescribed for the cleansing of the leprous house (vers. 49–53), and the cedar, scarlet and hyssop, were also burned with the red heifer, whose ashes, placed in water, were to be used for purifications (Num. xix. 6). The water, the blood, the cedar and the scarlet are mentioned in the Ep. to the Heb. (ix. 19, 20) as having been used by Moses in sprinkling the Book of the Covenant and the people (see Ex. xxiv. 6–8), and generally hyssop was used in various forms of sprinkling. Except therefore in regard to the birds, no significance can be attributed to these things which

is not common to other purifications besides those of the leper, and even in regard to the birds, none which is not common to the cleansing of the leprous man and the leprous house (ver. 53). In view of this, and of the analogy of the scapegoat (xvi. 21, 22), the living bird let loose must be considered as bearing away the uncleanness of the leper (Von Gerlach), and not as signifying the social resurrection of the leper in his restoration to the congregation. Of this last, the bird flying away to return no more could hardly have been a symbol. On the natural history of the cedar (*Juniperus oxycedrus*), and the hyssop, see Clarke. The scarlet is said in the *Mishna* to have been used for tying the other things to the living bird when they were dipped together in the water mingled with blood. Nothing is said of the disposal of all these things after they had fulfilled their purpose. After this ceremonial, the symbolical cleansing was still further set forth (ver. 8) by the leper's washing his clothes, and shaving off all his hair, and bathing himself. He might then enter the camp, but not yet his own tent. This remaining restriction seems designed to still further impress upon the mind the fearful character of the disease from which the leper had recovered; and still more, to postpone the full restoration of the leper to his family until he had first, by the prescribed sacrifices, been restored to fellowship with God.

Ver. 9. After an interval of a week, the restored person was to be again shaved completely, to again wash his clothes, and again bathe himself. He was now prepared to offer the prescribed sacrifices on the following day; for he was now **clean.**

Vers. 10–20. The restoration to fellowship with God, and admission to the sanctuary. Now for the first time the cleansed leper brings himself the things necessary for the completion of his cleansing. Three victims are to be offered; for a trespass, for a sin, and for a burnt offering. With these also he brought the prescribed oblation and the oil for his anointing; the oil was to be waved with the trespass offering (ver. 12) as its consecration to God, and the whole oblation (although *three* tenth deals seem to be required with reference to the three sacrifices) was to be offered upon the altar with the burnt offering (ver. 20). The flour amounted to nearly six quarts, the separate oil to about half a pint. Ver. 12. **Offer him for a trespass offering.**—The offering thus designated was not required to be of a definite value, as in the ordinary trespass offerings, and it was altogether peculiar in its ritual, being waved with the oil **for a wave offering before the Lord.**—This was never done with any part of the ordinary trespass offering (v. 14–vi. 7); only in the sacrifice of xxiii. 20 was the *whole* victim ever waved; as still another peculiarity, the wave offering was placed in this case, not in the hands of the offerer, but in those of the priest. What then was here the significance of the waving? Keil, Clark, and others, consider it as a consecration of the cleansed leper represented by the victim. It is true that there was, in the ritual as a whole, a kind of consecration of the person to his restored position as one of the people of the LORD; but this can scarcely have been the meaning of this particular ceremony. When the Levites were consecrated to the service of the Lord by a wave offering, they were themselves waved (Num. viii. 11; Heb. A. V. marg.); when the priests were consecrated, the wave offering was placed in their hands, and consisted of certain parts, not of a trespass offering, but of their "ram of consecration" (viii. 25-28); when portions of the ordinary peace offerings were consecrated by waving, they were always placed in the hands of the offerer. From all these the waving of the whole ram of the leper's trespass offering essentially differs; nor does it seem possible that it could signify his consecration, unless it were in some way placed in his own hands. More probably, this part of the ritual was simply designed to distinguish the leper's from the ordinary trespass offering; that while it was still to be classed generically with that offering, it was yet specifically distinct from it. A consideration of this fact will remove, partially at least, the difficulty of understanding why a trespass offering should have been required of the cleansed leper. The reason given by Oehler and others, that it was a kind of fine, or satisfaction rendered for the fact, that during the whole period of his sickness, in consequence of his exclusion from the camp, the leper had failed to perform his theocratic duties, is shown by Keil to be entirely untenable, since no such offering was required in parallel cases of persons excluded from the sanctuary when affected with diseased secretions; to this it may be added, that no penalty was required, as in the case of trespass offerings for such offences. Nor is the reason above given by Lange quite satisfactory. The true idea in this offering seems to be that the leper, by his very sickness, had been in the condition of an offender against the theocratic law of purity; yet that this was, in his case, not an actual, but only a *quasi* trespass, is shown by the omission to require it to be of definite value and by the ritual directing it to be made also into a wave offering. The leper had not merely failed to present his required offerings in consequence of his exclusion from the camp, but he had actually lived in a condition of extremest theocratic uncleanness (far more so than in the case of the secretions), and consequently in symbolic opposition to the Head of the theocracy. He must therefore present a trespass offering; but as all this had been done not only involuntarily, but most unwillingly, the offering was distinguished by being waved. Ver. 13. **For as the sin offering is the priest's, so is the trespass offering.**—This, already known as the general law (vii. 7), is here repeated, because otherwise the peculiarity of this trespass offering might seem to make it an exception. **It is most holy.** See on ii. 3.

In regard to the order of the various offerings: here the sin offering (ver. 19) precedes the burnt offering according to the general rule; but the trespass offering comes before them both. The reason above given why the trespass offering should have been offered at all, explains also why it should have been offered first. In the case of the reconsecration of the defiled Nazarite (Num. vi. 11, 12), the condition of the offerer was different; he was already in full standing

as a member of the theocracy, and offered the sin-offering first, and then the trespass offering. Here the healed leper must present the trespass offering first, as the mark of his restoration to the privileges of the theocratic community, before he offers any other sacrifice.

The restored leper was touched with the blood of the victim (ver. 14) in the same way as the priests with the blood of the ram of consecration (viii. 23), and doubtless with the same general symbolical meaning. Next comes the use of the oil. It was first employed in a sevenfold sprinkling towards the sanctuary (ver. 16), and then touched with the finger of the priest upon all the points which had already been touched with the blood of the victim, "which seems to have been a token of forgiveness by the blood, and of healing by the oil." Patrick. With the remnant of the oil in his hand, the priest was to anoint **the head of him that is to be cleansed.** In all this then there appears with sufficient plainness, a kind of consecration; but it was a consecration, not to any peculiar position or privilege, but simply to his becoming again one of the chosen people—the nation who were by their calling "a kingdom of priests,"—from whom he had been temporarily excluded. This is sufficiently shown by the following clause, to **make an atonement for him before the LORD.** The unction was not as a propitiation for his sin, in the ordinary sense of the word—that is provided for by the same expression in connection with the sin offering in the following verse (ver. 19); but it was to *cover over* the gulf by which he had been separated, to make an *at-onement* for him who had been alienated and separated by his leprosy. Then follows the sin offering with its proper atonement. There need be no question here of the propriety of the sin offering; it was always in place for sinful man, but especially for one who had been so long debarred from bringing it to the altar. Lastly, came also (ver. 20) the burnt offering with its atonement. With the last was offered a threefold oblation; for although the oblation might not be offered with the trespass and sin offering, yet in this case these were so peculiar in their use that they were able each to pass on an additional oblation, as it were, to the burnt offering.

Vers. 21–31. The alternative offering of the poor leper. In this case all things proceed as before with the same offerings and the same ritual, except that for the sin and burnt offerings, turtle doves or young pigeons are allowed, and the oblation is reduced to the normal oblation for the burnt offering (Num. xv. 4) of **one tenth deal of fine flour mingled with oil.**

It will be seen that the restoration of the healed leper thus consisted of several stages. First, he was examined by the priest, and satisfactory evidence being found that the disease was cured, he was then purified *without the camp* by a solemn and significant ceremonial, which yet was not a sacrifice. After this he was admitted to the camp, but must still remain a week without entering either his own tent or the sanctuary. At the end of this time he offered a singularly full and solemn sacrifice, consisting of a modified trespass offering, together with a sin and burnt offering. He was touched with the blood of his offering and anointed with oil. Each stage of his restoration was marked by lustrations. Thus at last was he once more restored to full communion with God and full fellowship with the covenant people.

D. Leprosy in a house. Vers. 33–53.

The communication on this subject is again addressed to Moses and Aaron conjointly, since here again the exercise of the priestly functions of examination and determination is called into play (ver. 33), and it all looks forward distinctly to the future, **when ye be come into the land of Canaan** (ver. 34), for in the wilderness, of course, they had no houses. The wholly prospective character of this part of the law explains why it is placed last of all.

"This regulation is plainly concerning keeping the houses clean,—the sanitary police as regards the houses;—just as the Jewish poor-law (see Winer, Art. *Arme etc.*) is a striking proof of the humanity of the Mosaic legislation. One may well say:—the tender care for the superintendence of health and of the poor, which here appears in Israel in typical and legal form, still in the Christian commonwealth comes far short of the true spiritual realization. Trouble of dwellings and poor troubles, bad dwellings and faulty superintendence of the poor, are a chapter which our time has first taken into the circle of its activity." Lange. That the "leprous" houses were unhealthy, does not yet seem established on sufficient proof; so far as this law is concerned, it may be that the legislation rests entirely on other grounds. At the same time, the view of Lange may be true.

Ver. 34. **I put the spot of leprosy in a house.**—"Thus also these evil conditions in houses are decrees of Jehovah. As the house is the enlarged human family, so the decree upon the house is an enlargement of the decree upon man." Lange. "Jehovah here speaks as the Lord of all created things, determining their decay and destruction, as well as their production; comp. Isa. xlv. 7." Clark. Abundant quotations from Jewish authorities are cited by Patrick, showing that they looked upon this infliction (from which, however, they considered Jerusalem to be exempted) as a special and direct divine judgment. Certainly, as Keil notes in opposition to Knobel, the expression here excludes the idea that the leprosy was communicated to houses by infection from man; and this becomes still more certain from the fact that the people who had been in the house are regarded as clean.

When notice had been sent to the priest (ver. 35) of a suspicious appearance in the house, he was first to order it to be "cleared (ver. 36), lest everything in it should become unclean. Consequently, as what was in the house became unclean only when the priest had declared the house affected with leprosy, the reason for the defilement is not to be sought for in physical infection, but must have been of an ideal or symbolical kind." Keil. The rules guiding the priestly examination, and the course to be pursued in consequence of his decision (vers. 37–47), are as nearly as possible like those given in the case of cloth and of skin. First: If on the preliminary examination there seemed to be good

ground for suspicion, the house was to be shut up for a week (ver. 38); it was then re-examined, and if the grounds of suspicion were confirmed by the spread of the trouble, the affected stones were to be taken out, the inside of the house scraped, and the stones and dirt to be carried **without the city unto an unclean place.** Then other stones were to be put in their place, and the house plastered with other mortar, (ver. 42). This ended the matter, if no fresh ground of suspicion arose. But if the trouble reappeared, the priest must examine the house once more, and if he found that the leprosy had broken out afresh, he must command the entire demolition of the house, and the carrying forth of its material to an unclean place (ver. 45). Any one entering the house while shut up became unclean till evening; and if he ate or slept in the house, he must also wash his clothes (vers. 46, 47). From what has been said before, it is clear that the ground of this provision was not any supposed danger of infection, but to prevent the contraction of symbolical uncleanness.

Vers. 48–53. The ceremony of purification. In case the leprosy did not spread in the house after the means used for its cure, the priest was to pronounce it clean, and then to perform purificatory rites exactly like those used for the leper without the camp. In reference to the views expressed there, Lange says, here "One may indeed ask whether the allegorizing there spoken of would also be proper here. The contrast between the living bird, which flies free, and the dead bird, seems here to illustrate the contrast between the healthy sojourn under God's free heaven, and the harmful sojourn in musty, diseased houses. But the fact is also here well worthy of note, that there is not the least mention made of any atoning worship." In ver. 53 it is said that the priest shall **make an atonement for the house.** This is often spoken of as figurative; but in fact it is better to take it quite literally. According to the primary meaning of the Hebrew word "he shall cover," *i. e.*, he shall, by this ceremony, put out of sight the uncleanness of the house; or in its derived and customary sense, he shall make an at-one-ment, *i. e.*, he shall restore the house from its tainted character, shut up and forbidden to be used, to its proper relations and purposes. On leprosy in garments and houses, see preliminary note.

E. Conclusion. Vers. 54–57.

These verses simply form the conclusion of the whole law of leprosy contained in chapters xiii. and xiv. Although these chapters are made up of no less than three separate divine communications (xiii. 1; xiv. 1; 33), yet they constitute altogether but one closely connected series of laws. The summary is in the usual form; but in ver. 56 the names of the symptoms of various forms of leprosy are repeated from xiii. 2.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I On leprosy in clothes: "The alternative, according to which the Levitical regulations are to have either a religious typical meaning alone, or a dietetic sanitary purpose alone, is here shown with especial clearness to be incorrect. The typical point, indeed, is not to be mistaken: even the attire of men was not to be infected with plague spots of sinful corruption. But not less prominently, the point of the moral duty of cleanliness is brought forward upon a religious basis." Lange, Exeg.

II. On leprosy in man: "We must distinguish between the horror of death of the Grecian spirit, and the theocratic antipathy against the signs of death in life, and the remains of the living in the corpse. The act of dying was ethical for the Hebrews in a bad, or in a good sense. Even the Old Testament knows an ethical Euthanasia opposed to the death of despair. But in a sphere where all is founded upon immortal life, a being for life and not for death, all signs of decay must be put aside." Lange, Exeg.

III. The peculiar defilement of leprosy, leading to exclusion from the camp, or in other words, to excommunication from the ancient church, evidently has its foundation in the peculiar character of the disease. It was especially associated with death, usually ultimately resulting in death, and being in its later stages, a sort of living death—a death already begun in the members—and presenting a fearful image of death. But death was the sentence upon sin, and hence leprosy and its treatment have always been understood as symbolizing sin and its treatment, both by Jewish and Christian commentators.

IV. The examination and determination of leprosy was intrusted to the priests, not on account of their being supposed to possess superior medical knowledge, but only in view of its theocratic relations. Any other treatment of the leper might properly be undertaken by physicians when any were to be had; but the exclusion of the leper from, or his restoration to the commonwealth of Israel, the communion of the church of God, was properly a priestly act. It is to this alone that the law applies. This was indeed, in strictness the province of God Himself; but as He committed the administration of His church in general to human hands, so also particularly in this matter. The sentence of the priests was final, and admitted of no appeal; the authority had been Divinely committed to them, and although they might perhaps sometimes decide wrongly, there was no other redress than a further examination when there seemed to be occasion for it, by the same authority. Thus was the priestly authority to bind and loose in the ancient church confirmed in heaven. Of course their decrees of exclusion from the earthly church did not determine anything concerning the leper's salvation.

V. By the extension of the term *leprosy* to garments and houses, and the similar treatment of them when thus affected, it seems to be taught that there is not merely an analogy, but a certain sympathy between man and the inanimate things by which he is surrounded. (Comp. Rom. viii. 22). They are to be associated in his mind with his own state and condition, and are to be so treated as to bring home to him in a lively way the things that concern himself. The Rabbins consider the trouble in houses as confined to the land of Canaan, and Divinely sent as a warning to the people against their sinfulness. If

this warning were unheeded, then the leprosy passed to their clothes, and finally to their persons. However this may be, it is noticeable that the leprosy here treated is only, as suggested by Lange, in the various habitations of the human spirit; in the body, which is indeed an actual part of the man himself, but which is often looked upon and spoken of as the tabernacle of the soul; in the clothing, which was a still more outer covering; and finally in the house, the outermost dwelling. Not a word is ever spoken of leprosy in animals.

VI. In the ceremonial for the purification of leprosy, so much more full than for any other defilement, it is seen how the purificatory rites rise in importance as the uncleanness becomes a more striking symbol of the impurity of sin. This symbolism reached its climax in the leper, and in his purification; but yet it was only symbolism; for as the defilement of sin lies deeper, so must the sacrifice for its removal be higher.

VII. Calvin observes that the final cleansing of the leper was appointed for the eighth day after his entrance into the camp. As his circumcision, or first admission into the church of God was on the eighth day after his birth into the world; so now he was, on the corresponding day, to be born again into the church after his exclusion. Another parallel, too, may be here carried out between first entering into communion with God, and being restored to it by repentance after having been alienated by sin.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"The priestly people of God have always a war to wage with the defilements of the natural life. . . . Especially is the uncleanness of leprosy, and in it of all diseases, to be combated; so also all the unhealthy conditions of houses and clothes are an object of the priestly battle, of the wrestling after an ideal moulding of all the conditions of life. How much these costly types still lack of their complete fulfillment in the Christian community has already been pointed out." Lange.

Leprosy defiled all who came in contact with it; a lively image of the contaminating effect of sin. See 1 Cor. xv. 33. Yet it did not defile the priests, who were to make a close and careful inspection of it, because this was their commanded duty; so neither does sin contaminate those who, in the fear of God and as duty to Him, strive to the utmost to recover and save the sinner.

As the priest for the purification of the leper went without the camp, and there stayed and held converse with the leper for his cleansing, so Christ left His dwelling-place in heaven and came among sinners that He might purify them from their sin. Hesychius. "It is remarkable how well even the Jewish teachers themselves understood the symbolical meaning of this regulation" [concerning the exclusion of the leper from the camp]; "for thus speaks one of them on this place: 'If a man considers this, he will be humbled and ashamed on account of his sin; since every sin is a leprosy, a spot upon his soul. And, as it is written of the leper, his clothes shall be rent, *etc.;* in like manner, the defilement on his soul, which is far removed from the holiness on high, shall equally separate him from the camp of Israel. And if a man turns to repentance in order to be cleansed from his spots, behold he is clean from his leprosy, but otherwise the leprosy remains clinging to his soul; and in this world, and in the world to come, he is far removed from the whole camp there above until he has become cleansed.' The law instructs how to know leprosy, pronounces the leper unclean, shuts him out from the congregation, but it has not power to heal him; this was reserved for the Son of God, to cleanse bodily in figure, and spiritually also, as the true Redeemer from sin and its consequences." Von Gerlach.

"Ceremonial uncleanness involves ceremonial guilt, and demands an atonement. So moral impurity involves moral guilt, which requires a propitiation. The uncleanness and the guilt mutually imply each other; yet they are totally distinct, and must be removed by totally different means. The Spirit of God by the truth of Revelation removes moral impurity; the Mediator, by His undertaking for the guilty, relieves him from the consequences of his guilt. . . . . The symbols of purification and propitiation come together in the ceremonial connected with the leper's re-entrance into communion with God. The water and the blood meet in the initial sacrifice; the oil and the blood are associated in the final one." Murphy.

As the cicatrices left by ulcers and burns were points where leprosy was peculiarly likely to be developed, so Origen, following the allegorical interpretation, notes that the wounds upon the soul, though healed, are peculiarly liable to become the occasion for the development of sin. The integrity of purity once lost, there is a dangerous spot in the heart which needs the care of the great Physician of souls.

The Christian Fathers generally give a spiritual interpretation of the two birds used in the purification of the leper or the leprous house. Thus Theodoret (Qu. 19): "They contain a type of the Passion of salvation. For as the one bird was slain and the other, dipped in its blood, was set free; so our Lord was crucified for leprous humanity, the flesh indeed receiving death, but the Divinity appropriating to itself the suffering of the humanity." This thought is quite common in the Fathers. The two birds typify the two natures of Christ, and the purification of the sinner is accomplished only by their union in Him.

The Fathers also consider the leprous house symbolical of Israel. (See *e. g.* Theodoret, Qu. 18): Israel was examined and purified, and the evil stones of its building removed by the many judgments upon the nation, and especially by the carrying away "without the camp" to Babylon. But at last when its incurable sin broke out afresh in the crucifixion of the Lord of life, the whole house was pulled down and its stones cast out into an unclean place.

Blood and water are constantly joined together in the purifications of the law, as in this of leprosy, so in all other cases. Whatever may be the underlying truth on which this symbolism rests, the symbolism itself culminates in the reality of the purification for sin accomplished by Christ upon the cross, out of whose side flowed the blood and the water for the cleansing of the world. See Jno. xix. 34; 1 Jno. v. 6, 8.

FOURTH SECTION.

Sexual Impurities and Cleansings.

Chapter XV. 1–33.

1,2 And the Lord spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying, Speak unto the children
of Israel, and say unto them, When any man hath a running issue out of his flesh,
3 *because of* his issue he *is* unclean. And this shall be his uncleanness in his issue:
whether his flesh run with his issue, or his flesh be stopped from his issue,[1] it *is* his
4 uncleanness. Every bed, whereon he lieth that hath the issue, is unclean: and
5 every thing, whereon he sitteth, shall be unclean. And whosoever toucheth his
bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the
6 even. And he that sitteth on *any* thing whereon he sat that hath the issue shall
7 wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even. And
he that toucheth the flesh of him that hath the issue shall wash his clothes, and
8 bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even. And if he that hath the
issue spit upon him that is clean; then he shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself*
9 in water, and be unclean until the even. And what saddle soever he rideth upon
10 that hath the issue shall be unclean. And whosoever toucheth any thing that was
under him shall be unclean until the even: and he that beareth *any of* those things
shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.
11 And whomsoever he toucheth that hath the issue, and hath not rinsed his hands in
water,[2] he shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until
12 the even. And the vessel of earth, that he toucheth which hath the issue, shall be
13 broken: and every vessel of wood shall be rinsed in water. And when he that
hath an issue is cleansed of his issue; then he shall number to himself seven days
for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, and
14 shall be clean. And on the eighth day he shall take to him two turtle doves, or two
young pigeons, and come before the Lord unto the door of the tabernacle of the
15 congregation, and give them unto the priest: and the priest shall offer them, the
one *for* a sin offering, and the other *for* a burnt offering; and the priest shall make
an atonement for him before the Lord for his issue.
16 And if any man's seed of copulation go out from him, then he shall wash all his
17 flesh in water, and be unclean until the even. And every garment, and every skin,
whereon is the seed of copulation, shall be washed with water, and be unclean until
the even.
18 The woman also with whom man[3] shall lie *with* seed of copulation, they shall
both bathe *themselves* in water, and be unclean until the even.
19 And if a woman have an issue, *and*[4] her issue in her flesh be blood, she shall be
put apart seven days: and[5] whosoever toucheth her shall be unclean until the even.
20 And every thing that she lieth upon in her separation shall be unclean: every
21 thing also that she sitteth upon shall be unclean. And whosoever toucheth her
bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.
22 And whosoever toucheth any thing that she sat upon shall wash his clothes, and
23 bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even. And if it *be* on *her* bed, or
on any thing whereon she sitteth, when he toucheth it, he shall be unclean until the
24 even. And if any man[3] lie with her at all, and her flowers be upon him, he shall
be unclean seven days; and all the bed whereon he lieth shall be unclean.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 3. The Sam. and LXX. here add the clause "he is unclean during all the time his issue runneth or is stopped."
[2] Ver. 11. According to the Syriac, this washing of the hands was to be the act, not of the unclean person himself, but of him whom he touched.
[3] Vers. 18 and 24. The Sam. adds the possessive pronoun making this "her husband."
[4] Ver. 19. The Sam. and 10 MSS. supply the missing conjunction.
[5] Ver. 19. The conjunction here is omitted by many MSS., the LXX. and Vulg.

25 And if a woman have an issue of her blood many days out of the time of her separation, or if it run beyond the time of her separation; all the days of the issue of her uncleanness shall be as the days of her separation: she *shall be* unclean.
26 Every bed whereon she lieth all the days of her issue shall be unto her as the bed of her separation: and whatsoever she sitteth upon shall be unclean, as the uncleanness of her separation.
27 And whosoever toucheth those things[6] shall be unclean, and shall wash his clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even.
28 But if she be cleansed of her issue, then she shall number to herself seven days, and
29 after that she shall be clean. And on the eighth day she shall take unto her two turtles, or two young pigeons, and bring them unto the priest, to the door of the
30 tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation. And the priest shall offer the one *for* a sin offering, and the other *for* a burnt offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for her before the LORD for the issue of her uncleanness.
31 Thus shall ye separate[7] the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle [dwelling place[8]] that *is* among them.
32 This *is* the law of him that hath an issue, and *of him* whose seed goeth from him,
33 and is defiled therewith; and of her that is sick of her flowers, and of him that hath an issue, of the man and of the woman, and of him that lieth with her that is unclean.

[6] Ver. 27. בָּם 5 MSS. read בָּהּ toucheth *her*.

[7] Ver. 31. For וְהִזַּרְתֶּם = *ye shall separate*, the Sam., 4 MSS., LXX., and Vulg. read וְהִזְהַרְתֶּם = *ye shall warn*; but there seems no sufficient reason for the change.

[8] Ver. 31. מִשְׁכָּנִי properly signifies dwelling-place, and although always rendered *tabernacle* in Ex. and Lev. in the A. V., needs to be distinguished from the אֹהֶל. Comp. note on viii. 10.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The whole of Lange's Exegetical explanations under this chapter are here given. "1. In his sacrificial law, Moses has throughout translated moral conditions into ritual forms; and he has done this, under the spirit of revelation, truly with wonderful safety, striking precision, and delicacy. Accordingly he here shows the subtle, contagious effects in evil in legal pædagogic images of the sexual impurities, as they incur guilt, or are more or less innocent, in connection with original sin. In so far as our chapter refers back, it forms the climax of the preceding conditions of guilt; but in its reference to the following chapter, it forms the foundation for the idea of a general atonement for the people, still necessary after all the definite single atonements."

"2. The law carries with it the consequence that all men are placed, by virtue of their manifold connections and contacts, under the sentence: Ye are unclean—unclean even after all more definite atonements. Haggai has drawn out this thought fully; John the Baptist brought it into application (Hag. ii. 13 *ss.*, see Com. Matt. p. 68). Hence the great day of atonement must follow all the more special sin offerings, and even this can only suffice for pardonable sins; while the unpardonable sins were sent into the desert upon the he-goat designated for Azazel. The idea of the *πάρεσις*: Rom. iii."

"3. The cases of sexual impurity which are detailed here are the following:"

"Vers. 1–15. Latent flowing of semen, gonorrhœa. In this sense it is called **a running issue out of his flesh.** This uncleanness of the highest degree, as such, is defiling on every side: touching the bed of the unclean person, his seat, his body, his saddle; being smeared with his spittle, touching anything that passes from him;—all makes unclean in the first degree for one day, and requires a washing of the clothes, and a bath. The purifying quarantine lasts for eight days. Timidly he must approach the sanctuary with two turtle-doves, or young pigeons, one of which was appointed for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering. This disease not only contaminated, but extended its contaminating power to whatever it touched. In Num. v. 2, it is provided that the person so affected should be excluded from the camp." [It does not seem altogether certain that the affection here described was *gonorrhœa*, although it is so translated in the LXX., vers. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, *etc.* That the word *flesh* is not an euphemism (Knobel) for the organ of generation is evident from vers. 7 and 13; still, that the latter is in view as the seat of the issue, is more than probable from the analogy of the woman in ver. 19, But in regard to the character of the issue itself nothing is said. It could hardly have been hemorrhoidal, since there is no mention of blood; it is not likely to have been syphilitic (*gonorrhœa virulenta*), notwithstanding the opinion of Michaelis, (laws, art. 212), both because it is more than doubtful if this disease was known in antiquity, and because, if it existed, its presence would betray cause for more severe measures than are here prescribed; it may have been a *gonorrhœa* arising from weakness, according to the view of Lange, and as supposed by Jerome and the Rabbins; but it is noticeable that there is no mention whatever made of *semen* in connection with it, and in xxii. 4, this is distinguished from "a running issue." Or it may have been "more probably, simply *blennorrhœa urethræ*,

a discharge of mucus arising from a catarrhal affection of the mucous membrane of the urethra (urethritis)." Keil; so too, Kalisch. In ver. 3, a distinction is noticed in the character of the disease which, however, was of no consequence for the purpose in hand; the issue might be continuous, or it might be temporarily retained. In either case the disease was there, and its subject was unclean. Rosenmüller would understand *flesh* in ver. 7 to be an euphemism as in ver. 2, and the law to cover especially the case of the physician. In ver. 11 a provision is made that the person affected might prevent the communication of uncleanness by his touch, by first rinsing **his hands in water**; thus showing that the uncleanness communicated was of a symbolical character. Vers. 14, 15 provide for a sin offering and burnt offering, of the humblest kind indeed, but yet here, as everywhere in the law, sufficient to keep alive the association between uncleanness and sin. It is declared that **the priest shall make an atonement for him before the LORD for his issue**, thus distinctly declaring his uncleanness to have been the ground of an alienation from God, to be removed by a propitiatory sacrifice.—F. G.].

"Vers. 16, 17. A single emission of seed was treated as a single uncleanness." [It is probable that the law had in view an involuntary act; but it would, nevertheless, apply in all cases, and thus its importance in checking the fearful evil of self-pollution needs no comment.—F. G.].

"Ver. 18. So too was the result of a man and woman sleeping together." [This euphemism may possibly be misunderstood. The uncleanness resulted only in case of sexual intercourse, and hence abstinence from such intercourse was a necessary part of preparation for occasions especially requiring cleanness. Ex. xix. 15; 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6, *etc.* The law must have operated as an important check upon sensual passions. For proof that the same custom was common among other nations, see Knobel. It is always to be remembered, however, that this defilement is connected with the general sinful condition of man, and did not pertain to his original state. See Gen. i. 28.—F. G.].

"Vers. 19–24. The menstruation was defined as an uncleanness for seven days." [The actual duration is not normally more than four or five days; but the period of a week seems to be fixed, partly to fully cover all ordinary cases, partly "on account of the significance of the number seven." Keil. During all this time the woman communicated uncleanness to every person she touched: but especially (ver. 24) whoever had sexual intercourse with her (for Keil shows that this must be the meaning) became unclean for the full term of her uncleanness, seven days. In xx. 18 it is provided that in case of such intercourse both parties should be "cut off from among their people," as having committed an abominable act. The case here provided for must therefore be that of the sudden and unexpected coming on of menstruation, so that the man became unintentionally defiled. But while uncleanness was thus strongly communicated to *persons*, it only affected among *things* those on which the woman sat or lay down. She was thus not debarred from the fulfillment of her ordinary domestic duties.

[It has already been noticed under chap. xii. that the provisions of the law in regard to child birth are intentionally separated from the present law in order to mark birth distinctly and emphatically as a subject by itself. The two things may be closely connected naturally; but when there has occurred another beginning of human life, the entrance upon the world of another immortal and accountable being, the event has a gravity and importance which requires its distinct treatment apart from the ordinary, frequently recurring conditions of life.—F. G.].

"Vers. 25–30. The woman diseased with a bloody issue was placed under the same regulation as the man with a flow of semen." [Blood seems to be used here (as throughout this chapter) for that which has the general appearance of blood, and is popularly called by that name. Hence what is here referred to is an issue of a menstrual character, either out of its proper time, or prolonged beyond its time. This being abnormal required the same treatment, the same exclusion from the camp (Num. v. 2), and the same offering for its "atonement" as in the case of the man. Ordinary menstruation required no sacrifice.—F. G.].

"Ver. 31. The supplement, **Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel**, *etc.*, shows that these regulations are not merely typical, but also sanitary; that they aim at the duty of sexual purity, both in moral, and in bodily relation. The lying of a man with an unclean woman, vers. 33 and 24, is to be distinguished from the sexual intercourse (ch. xviii. 19; xx. 18"). [But see under vers. 19–24.—F. G.].

"That of all the impurities the sexual are rendered so prominent, shows the earnest consecration wherewith the law places the sexual fountain of the natural life of man under the law of chastity and holiness. So also it abhors exceedingly profanations or defilements of this fountain. On this side the rudeness of heathenism spreads through all the centuries of the Christian era like a dark shadow, while the consecration of the sex life was already announced in the centre of Israel in presage of ideal nuptials." [On the existence of similar ordinances and customs among other nations, see Knobel, Bähr, and the various articles in the Bible Dictionaries.—F. G.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. All the defilements in this and the preceding chapters are here presented on their theocratic, not on their natural side. Nothing is anywhere said in them of means of cure. The attitude of the priest toward them is not that of the physician, aiming at their removal; but rather of the guardian of the sanctuary, first determining their existence, and then when they have been removed, undertaking the purifications by which the polluted person may be restored to his forfeited privilege of approaching God in His sanctuary, and again mingling with the holy people.

II. The object of the laws of purity is mani-

festly mainly moral. They may also have incidentally a hygienic purpose, but this is entirely subordinate. The main object is the maintenance of the majesty of God. Nothing impure may appear in His presence, and hence all those bodily conditions which are associated with, and suggestive of impurity, are marked as unclean, and not only the persons affected by them are excluded from the sanctuary, or even from the camp, but all contact with them is to be avoided by the holy people.

III. Very much is often said of the extreme frequency of these defilements, as if the Israelites must, under the operation of these laws, have lived in an almost perpetual state of ceremonial uncleanness. But it is to be remembered that we have in these chapters a collection of the cases of uncleanness provided for, which has upon the mind of the reader something of the effect of the perusal of a medical book; finding so many diseases enumerated, he is apt to suppose a state of disease far more common than it really is. Uncleanness, notwithstanding its apparent frequency when the account of all its varieties is collected together, was still an abnormal state, and in the great majority of cases continued only a short time, being limited by the approaching "evening" at whatever time in the day it may have occurred.

IV. In the Levitical legislation the difference between actual sin and uncleanness which was merely symbolical of sin, is made to appear very clearly. In this chapter particularly, four cases of uncleanness are mentioned, two of which (2–15, and 25–30) were simply diseases, and the other two (16–24) entirely natural and sinless; yet not only did the disease make unclean, but also that natural act or condition, which according to the Divine constitution is necessary for the perpetuation of the race in accordance with His own command. In all this there can be nothing sinful in itself; but as man's whole condition is sinful, so are these things constituted unclean, thereby to symbolize, and impress upon the mind of man the character of his whole relation to God who is perfect in holiness.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The laws of this chapter impose many restraints upon the intercourse of the sexes; that was the will of God shown of old by definite educational precepts. It remains His will still, no longer embodied in such precepts, but announced in general principles. See 1 Thess. iv. 4.

That the defilements here spoken of were ceremonial and symbolical only, is shown by the fact (ver. 12) that the earthen vessel was to be broken, while the wooden one (which is also absorptive) was only to be rinsed with water. Had the defilement been actual, the law must have been the same for both. Theodoret.

The especial object of the laws of uncleanness is declared (ver. 31) to be lest "**they defile my tabernacle.**" Many things which are natural and right in this our earthly life, are yet unsuitable for the immediate presence of God. Man may, nay, under the Divine constitution of his nature, must do many things which yet are so far apart from the spirituality of the Divine Nature that they evidently need to be widely separated from acts of worship. Yet they are not thereby condemned as sinful, but only there is brought into prominence the infinite distance by which man is separated from God.

"Not only cleanness, but cleanliness also, had its meaning, embodied in religious customs, as the 15th chapter shows, in the most striking features under the law. Uncleanness may exist, even with a considerable measure of religious feeling and good-will in the forms of negligence, of false artlessness, and even of a wild geniality. In the delineation of the endlessly fine and subtle contagious power of uncleanness, there comes into view the whole mysterious connection of mankind in sinfulness, as it has been shown by the prophet Haggai (ch. ii.), and as it lies as the foundation for the baptism of John the Baptist. Thus also this idea of the immeasurable and inscrutable contagion, and of the totality and universality of its guilt, leads to the need and the establishment of the universal and common atonement. It presages an express, great, and single Divine institution." Lange.

PART FOURTH. THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

"*The Annual, Universal, National Feast of Purification. The Great Day of Atonement, and the Great Propitiation.*"—LANGE.

CHAP. XVI. 1–34.

1 AND the LORD spake unto Moses after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when
2 they offered[1] before the LORD, and died; and the LORD said unto Moses, Speak

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. The LXX., the Targs. of Onk., Jon. and Jerus, the Vulg. and Syr. here insert the words *strange fire*, as is obviously implied.

unto Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy *place* within the vail before the mercy seat, which *is* upon the ark; that he die not: for I will
3 appear in the cloud upon the mercy seat. Thus [With this[2]] shall Aaron come into the holy *place:* with a young bullock for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt
4 offering. He shall put on the [a[3]] holy linen coat, and he shall have the [*omit* the[3]] linen breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with a linen girdle, and with the [a[3]] linen mitre shall he be attired: these *are* holy garments; therefore
5 shall he wash [bathe[4]] his flesh in water, and *so* put them on. And he shall take of the congregation of the children of Israel two kids [bucks[5]] of the goats for a sin offering, and one ram for a burnt offering.
6 And Aaron shall offer his bullock of the sin offering, which *is* for himself, and
7 make an atonement for himself, and for his house. And he shall take the two goats, and present them before the LORD *at* the door of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] con-
8 gregation. And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD,
9 and the other lot for the scapegoat [for Azazel[6]]. And Aaron shall bring the goat
10 upon which the LORD's lot fell, and offer him *for* a sin offering. But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat [for Azazel[6]], shall be presented alive before the LORD, to make an atonement with him, *and* to let him go for a scapegoat [for Azazel[6]] into the wilderness.
11 And Aaron shall bring the bullock of the sin offering, which *is* for himself, and shall make an atonement for himself, and for his house, and shall kill the bullock
12 of the sin offering, which *is* for himself: and he shall take a [the[7]] censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar before the LORD, and his hands full of
13 sweet incense beaten small, and bring *it* within the vail: and he shall put the incense upon the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense may cover the
14 mercy seat that *is* upon the testimony, that he die not: and he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle *it* with his finger upon[8] the mercy seat eastward [on the east side[9]]; and before the mercy seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times.
15 Then shall he kill the goat of the sin offering, that *is* for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the
16 bullock, and sprinkle it upon[8] the mercy seat, and before the mercy seat: and he shall make an atonement for the holy *place*, because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and because of their transgressions in all their sins: and so shall he do for the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation, that remaineth among them
17 in the midst of their uncleanness. And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy *place*, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his
18 household, and for all the congregation of Israel. And he shall go out unto the altar that *is* before the LORD, and make an atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the horns of the
19 altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his fingers seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel.
20 And when he hath made an end of reconciling [making atonement for[10]] the holy *place*, and the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation, and the altar, he

[2] Ver. 3. בְּזֹאת. There seems no reason why the Heb. should not be rendered literally.

[3] Ver. 4. The articles are not in the Heb., and should be omitted as misleading.

[4] Ver. 4. רָחַץ, see Textual Note [30] on xiv. 8. The Sam. and LXX. insert the word *all* before *his flesh*.

[5] Ver. 5. שְׂעִירֵי, see Textual Note [21] on iv. 23. The same word is used also vers. 7, 8, *etc.*; but it seems unnecessary to alter the translation throughout, as this is the only place in which the sense is affected.

[6] Vers. 8, 10 (*bis*), 26. עֲזָאזֵל. The word occurs only here, and in the wide difference of opinion existing as to its meaning, it seems far better to retain the Heb. word unchanged, as is done in many modern critical translations. It occurs in all cases without the article. For the meaning, see exegesis.

[7] Ver. 12. It is better to retain the definite article, as expressed in the Heb.

[8] Vers. 14, 15. For עַל=*upon*, the Sam. reads אֶל=*before, towards*.

[9] Ver. 14. קֵדְמָה=*toward the east* is to be connected with the *mercy seat*, and not with *sprinkle*. The high priest looking west, faced the mercy seat, and sprinkled it on the side next to him, *i. e.* the side toward the east. This cannot be clearly expressed in English without a slight modification of the phrase.

[10] Ver. 20. כִּפֶּר. See Textual Note [17] on vi. 30 (23).

21 shall bring [offer[11]] the live goat: and Aaron shall lay both his hands[12] upon the
head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of
Israel, and all their trangressions in [according to[13]] all their sins, putting them
upon the head of the goat, and shall send *him* away by the hand of a fit[14] man into
22 the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land
not inhabited:[15] and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.
23 And Aaron shall come into the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation, and
shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the holy *place*,
24 and shall leave them there: and he shall wash [bathe[4]] his flesh with water in the
holy place, and put on his garments, and come forth and offer his burnt offering,
and the burnt offering of the people, and make an atonement for himself, and for
25 the people. And the fat of the sin offering shall he burn upon the altar.
26 And he that let go the goat for the scapegoat [for Azazel[6]] shall wash his clothes
27 and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward come into the camp. And the bullock
for the sin offering, and the goat *for* the sin offering, whose blood was brought in
to make atonement in the holy *place*, shall *one* carry forth without the camp; and
28 they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung. And he
that burneth them shall wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, and after-
ward he shall come into the camp.
29 And *this* shall be a statute for ever unto you: *that* in the seventh month, on the
tenth *day* of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and do no work at all, *whether*
30 *it be* one of your own country, or a stranger that sojourneth among you: for on
that day shall *the priest* make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, *that* ye may
31 be clean from all your sins before the LORD. It *shall be* a sabbath of rest unto
32 you, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever. And the priest, whom
he [one[16]] shall anoint, and whom he [one[16]] shall consecrate to minister in the
priest's office in his father's stead, shall make the atonement, and shall put on the
33 linen clothes, *even* the holy garments: and he shall make an atonement for the
holy sanctuary, and he shall make an atonement for the tabernacle of the [*omit*
the] congregation, and for the altar, and he shall make an atonement for the priests,
34 and for all the people of the congregation. And this shall be an everlasting sta-
tute unto you, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins
once a year.

And he did as the LORD commanded Moses.

[11] Ver. 20. הַקְרֵיב, the same word as is used of the other goat in ver. 9, and the common word for sacrificial offering.

[12] Ver. 21. For the יְדֵי of the text, 35 MSS. read יְדֵי, as in the k'ri.

[13] Ver. 21. *According to* is both a better translation of the prep. לְ and gives a better sense.

[14] Ver. 21. עִתִּי, ἀπ. λέγ., according to Fuerst *existing* or *appointed at a convenient time.* LXX. ἕτοιμος, Vulg. *paratus.* The sense of *appointed* would probably bettter express the Heb. than *fit* (so Targ. Jon., and so Rosenmueller); but there is neither sufficient certainty nor sufficient difference to make the change.

[15] Ver. 22. גְּזֵרָה. LXX. ἄβατον, Vulg. *solitariam*, Onk. *uninhabitable*, Jon. *desolate*, Syr. *uncultivated.* Lit. *a land cut off.* The A. V. sufficiently expresses the sense.

[16] Ver. 32. These verbs must either be rendered impersonally, or else taken in the passive, as the Heb. idiom very well allows.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Here a new *Parashah* of the law begins, extending through ch. xviii. Amos ix. 7–15 forms the parallel Proper Lesson from the prophets. That prophecy is cited by St. James at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 16, 17), and applied to the building up of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ. Wordsworth suggests that he may have selected that particular prophecy because it was associated in his mind, through the public readings in the synagogues, with the passage before us "which displays, in a figure, the work of Christ, our great High Priest, entering into the heavenly Holy of Holies, and reconciling the world to God by His own blood (Heb. ix. 7–12, 24–28)."

This chapter forms the culmination of all that has gone before, of the laws both of sacrifices and of purity, and therefore forms the fitting conclusion of the whole portion of Leviticus concerned with the means of approach to God. The significance of its symbolical ritual is dwelt upon in the 9th ch. of the Ep. to the Heb. The Holy of Holies was entered only on the day and with the sacrifices here prescribed, and this day was the only day of fasting appointed in the Mosaic law. The ritual of its sacrifices was peculiar and impressive, and the goat for Azazel

is something so unlike any thing else in the Levitical system as to have occasioned the utmost perplexity to expositors. In xxiii. 27 (Heb.) the day is called "the day of *atonements* (in the plural), as if this included in itself all other atonements, or at least was the most exalted and important of them all. In ver. 31 (Heb.) it is spoken of as a "Sabbath of Sabbaths," and by the later Jews it was commonly called simply "Joma,"=day, as the day of all days. It is probably intended by St. Luke in the expression "the fast," Acts xxvii. 9. See Com. there. The high-priest alone could officiate, and this he must do in a peculiar dress worn only on this day. By the ritual of this day, the imperfection and insufficiency of all other sacrifices was brought prominently into view, while yet its own imperfection was necessarily involved in its yearly repetition.

The chapter consists of two portions, of which the first (vers. 2–28) contains directions for this great annual expiation; and the second (vers. 29–34), the command for its yearly celebration. The whole of Lange's Exegetical Notes are here given.

"1. It is first of all to be noticed that the yearly feast of atonement is mentioned twice in the Levitical law of worship, *viz.* once here as the culminating point of the laws and expiations of purifications; and again in ch. xxiii. in the midst of the feasts of the Lord for the positive sanctification of the land and the people, as a solemn prelude to the most festal and joyous of all the feasts, the feast of tabernacles. The point of unity of both lines is the thought: that Israel can then only attain to the full joys of the feast of tabernacles, when, on the great Sabbath of the seventh month—the single exclusive day of expiation and regular fast day of the year—it has humbled and purified itself before Jehovah with the confession, that all its legal atonements had not brought full purification; that the instruments of atonement, priests and altar, must themselves be atoned for; that not even by these comprehensive general supplications and general atonements could complete atonement be made; that a guilt remaining in secret must be sent home to Azazel as inexpiable under the *πάρεσις* of Jehovah (Rom. iii. 25)—an act with which the Levitical atonement sweeps out beyond itself to a future and real atonement.

"2. Corresponding to the thoughts that have been mentioned, we have:

"*a.* The prevailing unapproachableness of the holy God, only momentarily suspended through a hypothetical, typically accomplished power of approach, as the idea of a future perfect atonement. This law was enforced by the fact that the two eldest sons of Aaron had died through approaching profanely, and by the threat that he too should die if he went behind the curtain of the Holy of holies, where Jehovah was manifested in a cloud over the mercy-seat (Jer. xxx. 21), otherwise than according to the stated conditions, once a year. (Heb. ix. 7). Vers. 1, 2." [The historical connection of this chapter with the death of Nadab and Abihu does not exclude the logical connection with the legislation of the rest of the book. The provision for the day of atonement was necessary in any case to the completeness of the Levitical system, but the command for its observance was immediately occasioned by their unauthorized act. There are no data to show the length of the interval between their death and the Divine communication contained in this chapter; but it was probably short. Ver. 2. **Within the vail**—which separated the holy place, the outer part of the sanctuary where the priests daily ministered at the altar of incense, from the holy of holies which was never to be entered by man except as provided for in this chapter. On the significance of this arrangement see Doctrinal remarks below. The custom of having peculiarly sacred parts in the heathen temples is well known. **The mercy-seat.**—כַּפֹּרֶת LXX. *ἱλαστήριον*, Vulg., *propitiatorium*, and so the other ancient versions. The LXX. word is twice used in the N. T., being translated *mercy-seat* in Heb. ix. 5, but *propitiation* in Rom. iii. 25. The word occurs only in Ex., in this chapter, and in Num. vii. 89, and 1 Chr. xxviii. 11. It is evident from Ex. xxv. 22; xxx. 6; and Num. vii. 89, that it was the place appointed for the peculiar manifestation of the presence of God; and from this chapter, that it was the objective point of the highest propitiatory rites known to the law. The English word only partially conveys the sense. **I will appear in the cloud.**—There has been much question whether this means the light-giving cloud which overshadowed and at certain times filled the tabernacle, and which according to the Jewish authorities, was afterwards represented by the *Shechinah* above the ark; or whether it refers simply to the cloud of incense arising from the censer of the high-priest as he passed within the vail. The subject is ably and fully discussed by Bähr (Symb. I. c. V. § 2, IV. 2d aufl., pp. 471–481) who concludes in favor of the latter. See the authorities there cited. The determination in reality involves two separate questions: first, whether the promise of the text is personal to Aaron, or whether it is given in perpetuity to him and his successors in the high-priesthood; and second, whether, after the cessation of the wanderings in the wilderness, there ever was such a Shechinah. In regard to the latter question, later Jewish tradition, from the time of the Targums down, is certainly sufficiently emphatic in the affirmative; but for so remarkable and perpetual a miracle, higher authority is required. Bähr has shown that Philo and Josephus, as well as the Christian Fathers to the time of S. Jerome, knew nothing of it, and it is never mentioned in the Scriptures, or in the Jewish Apocryphal books. Nevertheless, the incense is not spoken of until ver. 12, and it seems unlikely that the cloud from it should be intended here. God had hitherto manifested His presence to Moses and to the people in the cloud which covered the tabernacle, and that in various localities; it would not be strange that He should now promise a similar manifestation to Aaron by the same instrumentality. That this should take place upon the mercy-seat was a consequence of Aaron's coming before it in this highest act of propitiation. Of course this would give no ground to suppose that such a manifestation

continued there perpetually, or at any other time than that on which it is here especially promised. Rosenmüller, Keil, and most other commentators, however, accept the Jewish tradition of the Shechinah.—F. G.].

"*b.* He must next protect himself with a great sacrifice; for he is directed to take **a young bullock for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering.** By these the great faults of the priesthood on the one side, and the great duties on the other side are signified," ver. 3. [**Come into the holy** is sometimes understood in relation to Aaron's entrance into the tabernacle merely, because these offerings were offered before he passed beyond the court at all; but as the point of the whole ritual is the entrance into the holy of holies, the words are more fitly interpreted in relation to this. Full account is given of the ritual of the sin offering in vers. 11–14 and 27, 28; the sacrifice of the priestly burnt offering was at the same time with that of the people at the conclusion of the other sacrifices (ver. 24].—F. G.].

"*c.* After this, he is to make himself the atoner for the collective priesthood. All the high-priestly ornaments were laid aside, and he was clothed with a linen coat over linen drawers, and girt with a linen girdle. The linen cap completed the attire. Even this enrobing must be preceded by a religious lustration" (ver. 4)." [This clothing is called the **holy garments**, vers. 4 and 32; and it is separated from that of the common priests by a white **linen girdle** in place of the ordinary priestly girdle wrought in needle-work with "blue and purple and scarlet" (Ex. xxxix. 29). The high-priest is thus to lay aside his "golden garments" of authority, and to be clad in pure white as symbolical of holiness. This symbolism was increased by his bathing himself before putting on these garments, and again when he exchanged them (ver. 24) for his official robes. These bathings were not the mere ordinary bathings of the hands and feet, but of the whole body.—F. G.].

"*d.* Only in such guise can he receive the means of atonement for the congregation involved with him in guilt, the two he-goats, which in the *more general sense*, are appointed for a sin offering. In the presentation of the burnt offering, however, the congregation was equalized with the high-priest himself. But how inconsiderable is the he-goat in comparison with the young bullock, ver. 5." [**He shall take of the congregation.**—Inasmuch as these sacrifices were for the people, the victims were supplied by them, as the former ones had been by Aaron. The fact that the two goats together constitute the sin offering is to be particularly noted. The high-priest's sin offering was a bullock, as provided in iv. 3, and the ordinary sin offering for the whole congregation was the same (*ib.* 14); here it is changed to two goats to meet the particular ritual provided, but they together constitute a single sin offering. In the same way two birds were required for the purification of the leper (xiv. 4), or to "make atonement for the leprous house (*ib.* 53) one of which was set free; and so also in the sin offering of the poor (v. 7), two doves were required which were differently treated, but together made up a single sacrifice. The burnt offering, both for the high-priest and for the congregation, was not a bullock, but an inferior victim was prescribed, probably to avoid withdrawing the attention from the other sacrifices, and thus to bring out with greater force the significance of the whole work of the day as an atonement for sin.—F. G.].

"*e.* Now follows the ordinance for the atonement in a shorter statement. The sin offerings were placed together before the sanctuary, **presented before the Lord**; the bullock and the two he-goats; since the guilt is indeed different, but yet also common." [The text, however, distinctly separates the presentation of Aaron's bullock (ver. 6) from that of the he-goats for the people (ver. 7); and this is in accordance with the order of the actual sacrifice which follows. It seems also necessary to the idea that Aaron must first **make an atonement for himself and for his house** before proceeding to offer for the people.—F. G.]. "But now the mysterious act was performed: the lot was cast over the two he-goats, while the lot of the one was called **for Jehovah**, that of the other **for Azazel.** On the various significations of this, see below. Meantime, only the directions which belong to both are spoken of. Vers. 9 and 10." [6-10. The עָלָה used in vers. 9, 10 of the lots refers to the *coming up* of the lot out of the urn. Keil. Aaron's bullock is now *offered*, not sacrificed, for this comes afterwards, ver. 11; the same is true also of the other sin offerings. According to Jewish tradition, this offering was accompanied by the high-priest's making a solemn confession of sin, the form of which is given in *Massechet Joma* c. 3, § 8 (Patrick). **His house** is not his immediate, personal family, but the whole order of priests, and perhaps it also included the Levites after they were separated from the congregation.—**The two goats** of ver. 7 were to be, according to Jewish tradition, of the same size, color, and value, and as nearly alike in every way as possible. Both of them alike Aaron was directed to **present before the Lord**, but the word used for this act (וְהֶעֱמִיד) is a different one from that used of Aaron's offering of the bullock (הַקְרִיב), and does not appear to be used in a sacrificial sense. The lots were then cast, and only the one **upon which the LORD'S lot fell** was Aaron at present to *offer* (הַקְרִיב) **for a sin offering** (ver. 8) as he had already done with his own bullock; the other, **on which the lot fell for Azazel** was to **be presented alive** (יָעֳמַד־חַי) **before the Lord** (ver. 10). This difference in the treatment of the two goats from the outset is too important to be overlooked; but subsequently the other was also *offered* (ver. 20), and it is expressly said that Aaron should **make an atonement with him.**—Thus it is clear that the goat for Azazel, while forming part of the one sin offering and used for the purpose of atonement, was yet *offered* to the LORD, in the sacrificial sense, separately from the other.—F. G.].

"*f.* The sacrificial acts follow these preparations. Aaron must slay the sin offering of the priesthood in the court. Then he first brings a

large offering of incense (both **hands full of sweet incense**) into the holy of holies, a cloud of the fulness of prayer, which covers the whole mercy-seat, as this covers the law, the evidence of the guilt of sin. With this preparatory entrance only is made possible the principal entrance for fulfilling the priestly atonement, without Aaron's dying in that entrance. Then he comes back, brings the vessel of blood, and first sprinkles with his finger blood upon the mercy-seat on its front side, as if to express the thought that there is an atonement in the blood; then he sprinkles before the Kaporeth" [mercy-seat] "with his fingers (plural) seven times, as if to express the whole historical work of the blood of martyrdom which the blood-sprinkling of the Kaporeth" [mercy-seat] "crowned." [Vers. 11–14. It is important to the understanding of this day to keep the order of its rites distinctly in view. They have been clearly stated above: (1) the high-priest slew the bullock for the priestly sin offering; (2) then he entered the holy of holies with *the* golden censer (comp. Heb. ix. 4) full of burning incense; (3) taking the blood of his own sin offering, he again entered the holy of holies and sprinkled the blood, first upon the front side of the mercy-seat, and then seven times before it; (4) he again came out to slay the goat for the sin offering of the people (ver. 15).—F. G.]. "Now first follows the atonement for the people. Aaron takes the vessel of blood of the people's atonement, and performs the two sprinklings in the holy of holies as before. Here also the distinction is made **upon the mercy-seat** and **before the mercy-seat**. But as Aaron does not make atonement for his private guilt, of which mention was made in chap. iv., but for the faults in his sacrificial service itself, so is it also with the atonement for the people. For their private sins they have brought their sacrifices during the course of the year; now they have, in connection with the priesthood, to atone generally for the subtle sins in all their atonements and offerings." [Yet it would give an imperfect view of the purpose of the great day of atonement to suppose it restricted simply to atoning for defects in the various sacrifices of the past year, nor probably does Lange mean to be so understood. It was rather an expression of the inherent insufficiency of those sacrifices; an acknowledgment that, notwithstanding all those propitiations, there still remained an alienation between a sinful people and a perfectly holy God. It was the design of this day to acknowledge this, and by the most solemn and expressive types, symbolically to remove it; yet in the provision for its annual repetition, its own insufficiency to this end stands confessed, and with especial clearness it points forward to the only true remedy in Him who should really obtain the victory over the power of evil.—F. G.] "So first atonement was made for the sanctuary of the Temple" [or Tabernacle] "in the holy of holies (which indeed had itself remained unapproachable for sin as well as the sinner), and then from the holy of holies outward, **for the tabernacle of congregation**, which had been particularly exposed to defilement in the midst of the impurities of the people. That by **the tabernacle of congregation** is meant the court, is shown by the command that no one should enter it while he accomplishes the atonement." [On the other hand, Keil understands "the holy place of the tabernacle" in contradistinction to the "holy of holies," which is called throughout this chapter simply "the holy." So also Rosenmüller and others. **And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of congregation**.—The object of this was not to guard the privacy of the ceremony, but simply because all were regarded as defiled and to be atoned for, and every thing defiled must be excluded during the process of atonement.—F. G.] "The whole religion of the people appears as in abeyance while the high-priest was consummating the atonement. And fitly were these atoning acts so named. After the high-priest had completed the atonement in the holy of holies, he went back into the sanctuary, and there sprinkled the altar of incense. In a manner entirely analogous to the sprinkling upon the mercy-seat, he first sprinkled the horns of the altar of incense, and then the altar itself seven times." [The analogy is still more completely carried out by the change of words in the Heb. **put it** (נָתַן) **upon the horns of the altar.... he shall sprinkle** (הִזָּה) **of the blood upon it**.—F. G.] "Only in this sprinkling, the blood of the bullock is joined with the blood of the he-goat, as indeed the prayers of both priest and people rise together to God, and in like manner also their faults in prayer. It is remarkable that the act of sprinkling in the court (at the altar of burnt offering) seems to follow the act of sprinkling in the holy of holies, and not till then the sprinkling of the altar of incense in the temple" [tabernacle], "which is here called *par excellence* the altar. In this connection the passage Ex. xxx. 10 is worthy of note. Accordingly the atonement for this altar was the last act of sacrifice, and thereby the atonement for the theocratic prayer became the last point in the atonement, as indeed it had certainly been the basis for the first." [The ceremonies of propitiation began by carrying the burning incense, symbolizing prayer, within the vail; then the blood was sprinkled upon the instruments of propitiation, the mercy-seat and the brazen altar, and finally upon the altar of incense itself which was connected with the symbolism of prayer.—F. G.] "This ordinance seems to be connected with the thought that the altar of incense in its relation to Jehovah (**the altar that is before the LORD**) was reckoned as belonging to the holy of holies, as also the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to understand. After all this comes the treatment of the living he-goat, designated **for Azazel**. This goat was brought into the court. Here the high-priest must lay *both his hands* (his hand in the singular was said of the offerer i. 4; iii. 2; iv. 4; iv. 24) upon the head of the goat and confess upon it all the misdeeds (עֲוֹנֹת) of the children of Israel, and all their breaches of allegiance (deadly sins, crimes) (תִּשְׁעֵיהֶם), which belong to all their sins, which are not included either in the sins to be atoned for, or which have already been atoned for (לְכָל-חַטֹּאתָם), and shall lay these upon the head

of the goat, and shall send it away (hunt it away) into the wilderness by means of a man who stood ready for that purpose (therefore instantly). The object, however, is that the he-goat shall bear away all the sins, as if they had been laid upon him, into a *desolate place*. So shall he send him away into the wilderness, properly speaking, into a complete solitude, into a bare place in the midst of the wilderness, to the most desolate spot. So fearful indeed is the burden of guilt of this beast, that the man who has driven away the goat must first, outside the camp, wash his clothes and bathe himself before he may come back again into the camp. This is the contagious power of the deadly sins. It is to be considered that sins done with *uplifted hand* could not be removed by Levitical sacrifice."

"But further, they could not all be discovered and blotted out by the penalty of death, *the Cherem*. Thus there remained, after all the atonements and penalties, an unatoned and unpardonable residue, the hidden guilt of Israel, which crept on in darkness through its history until the crucifixion of Christ (Rom. iii. 25). From this the congregation of Israel could only be freed by a symbolical act, in which they hunted away this burden of guilt with the sin-goat of double power, to him to whom this guilt belonged, to the Azazel in the wilderness. That the solitude inside the pasturage of the wilderness was considered as a region of evil spirits is plain from passages of the Old and New Testaments (Isa. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 14; Matt. xii. 43 ss.); that further, the dismissing of the unpardonable sins could be considered as a giving over of the sinner, with his sin, to its author, is shown by the act of excommunication of Paul (1 Cor. v. 5), and that the idea or conception of a diabolical opposing spirit was handed down from patriarchal times, is plain, backwards, from Gen. iii., and forwards, from the position of Satan in Job, and other places. The name Azazel corresponds throughout to this conception. Whether the עֲזָאזֵל be derived from עָזַל, it means (from the verb in *Pihel*) the one that is always hiding, separating himself; or from אָזַל, the one that is always removing himself, the escaping one, the old one every where and nowhere; and one can only say simply that the various explanations which are most divergent from this conception are only to be accounted for from the want of understanding the undoubtedly very obscure and solemn idea of the text. Thus Knobel finds himself authorized by the text and the grammar to explain "our author considered Azazel as an evil being in the wilderness." To be sure, it is his purpose to assert in this connection that the devil does not appear in the old Hebrew books, and was not a dweller in the wilderness. [Similarly Kalisch argues, upon the same grounds, that this book must be later than the time of Zechariah!"—F. G.] That the teaching concerning the devil has only been gradually developed from the obscurest forms; that the devil appears in Scripture in connection with subordinate demons; that further, he is described in the New Testament as a dweller in the wilderness;* that finally, the conception of natural or spectral "Desert fiends" would be a dualistic one, contravening the spirit of the Old Testament—all this is overlooked in his skilfully prepared antithesis. But when Merx, in opposition to the interpretation of the passage of Satan, declares that the Old Testament consciousness is never dualistic, he has not learned to distinguish dualism from the biblical teaching in regard to Satan; and, as regards the further exposition, that the idea of Satan was foreign to the Old Testament, it is a pure assumption, with which he sets himself in opposition to the best recognized passages. The lately advanced proposition, "this thought does not appear any where else in Scripture," denies the conception of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, and can only be described as bad Hermeneutics, without mentioning that we have here nothing to do with a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*. Into what adventurousness Exegesis was brought when it passed to the thought, that the absolutely or relatively (for the Old Testament economy) inexpiable sins were given over to the kingdom of darkness for earlier or later judgment, is shown by the interpretations that are given:—Azazel signifies a locality in the wilderness; a desolate place; a mountain (while it is forgotten that the people journeyed from station to station); or the buck goat itself (from עֲזָ and עֵזֶל, *caper emissarius*, "*the scapegoat*" (*der ledige Bock*†) according to Luther); or Azazel is a demon, to whom this goat is brought as a sacrifice; or the word is an abstraction, and signifies the whole sending away, like the characteristic hesitation of the LXX. between *ἀποπομπή* and *ἀποπομπαῖος*, in which two different expositions are brought out." [In regard to the meaning of Azazel: in the great variety of etymologies given for the word by scholars of the highest standing, it may be assumed as certain that nothing can be positively determined by the etymology. See the Lexicons and Bochart, *Hieroz.* I., lib. II. c. 54 (Tom. I., p. 745 seq. ed. Rosen.); Spencer, *de leg.* L. III. Diss. 8, Sect. 2 (p. 1041 s. ed. Tübing.). Not only the roots themselves are varied, but their signification also, and still further the signification of the compound. Little light can be had from the Ancient Versions. The Sam., and the Targs. of Onk., Jon., and Jerus., retain the word unchanged; so also does the Syriac, but in Walton's Polyglott this is parenthetically translated *Deus fortissimus*, for which, however, there seems to be no more authority than in the Hebrew; the Vulg. has *caprus emissarius*; the LXX. renders in ver. 8, *τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ* (which Josephus also uses), in ver. 10 *εἰς τὴν ἀποπομπήν*, in ver. 26 *τὸν χίμαρον τὸν διεσταλμένον εἰς ἄφεσιν*; Symm. *ἀπερχόμενος*; Aq.

* [This statement is probably founded upon two facts—first, that of our Lord's having been led into the wilderness "to be tempted of the Devil;" but this does not imply that the Devil is in any especial sense a dweller in the wilderness, but only that this was a favorable situation for him to ply his temptations; and second, that certain men possessed of evil spirits sought solitary places. Other passages of the N. T. certainly present the Devil as eminently cosmopolitan. —F. G.]

† "Hiller indeed thinks, that the scape-goat (*der ledige Bock*) signifies that the people are set free by the expiation; only since they could not have let it run free in Jerusalem, they sent it into the wilderness!"

ἀπολελυμένος (or, according to Theodoret, ἀπολυόμενος; Theod. ἀφιέμενος. All these versions, it will be observed, either retain the word unchanged, or else refer it to the goat itself in the general sense of Luther, and the A. V. *scape-goat.* The old Italic, too, has *ad dimissionem.* The Jewish authorities differ, R. Saadias Gaon being quoted by Spencer, and Kimchi by Münster and others for the interpretation *rough mountain of God,* but many of them explaining the word of the Devil. Of the Christian Fathers, Origen (*contra Cels.* 6), and a Christian poet cited by Epiphanius (*Hæres.* xxxiv.) from Irenæus, identify Azazel with the Devil; on the other hand, Theodoret (Qu. xxii. *in Lev.*) and Cyril (*Glaph.*) concur with the interpretation of Jerome. Suidas and Hesychius make the LXX. ἀποπομπή—ἀποτροπή—*averruncus,* the averter of evil. (See Suicer *Thes.* S. V. ἀποπομπαῖος.) The great majority of modern commentators agree with Spencer and Rosenmüller in interpreting the word itself of the Devil, although Bähr, Winer, and Tholuck contend for the sense *complete removal.* The *Book of Enoch,* so called, uses the name, or one so like it as to be evidently meant for the same, several times (viii. 1; x. 12; xiii. 1), in a way that shows the author understood by it the Devil; but this book, being an apocryphal composition, probably of the second century, (see Excursus II. in my com. on S. Jude), can add nothing to the authorities already cited. The writers who adopt this sense differ very widely in regard to the object of the goat for Azazel, some considering him as a sacrifice to appease the evil spirit, others as sent "to deride and triumph over him in his own dominion," and others as simply "sent away to him as to one banished from the realm of grace." (Clark.) See the dissertations, among others, by Spencer and one by Hengstenberg in his *Egypt and the Books of Moses.*

In this great variety of interpretation of the word and of the meaning of the ritual, we are fairly remanded to the text itself with the conviction that nothing is certain except what is positively stated there. These points at least, are clear: (1) the two goats together constitute one sin offering, ver 5; and also in ver. 10, the goat for Azazel is expressly said to be presented **before the LORD to make an atonement with him.** לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו according to invariable usage, denotes the object of the expiation; "to expiate it, *i. e.,* to make it the object of expiation, or make expiation with it." Keil.) Nevertheless a distinction is observed in the text in the purpose of the expiation effected by each of the goats. The blood of the one that was slain is used only for making atonement for the holy places, vers. 15–19; after this it is expressly said, **and when he hath made an end of making atonement for the holy place,** *etc.* The expiation for these was then finished, and as yet no expiation had been made for the sins of the people. Then follows, **he shall bring the live goat,** and on his head the high-priest lays the sins of the people to be borne away. The two goats then constitute one sin offering, but one is used to expiate the holy places, the other to bear away the sins of the people. (2) The two goats were not *offered* together **in the** sacrificial sense, but only *caused to stand* before the Lord for the purpose of casting lots, ver. 7; afterwards the goat for sacrifice was *offered* (ver. 9) by himself, and the goat for Azazel (ver. 20) was *offered* by himself. (3) The lot was cast by Aaron as the officiating high-priest, and was plainly intended to place the choice of the goats entirely in the hands of the Lord Himself. (4) The preposition used is precisely the same in regard to both the goats: *for* (לַ) the LORD, *for* Azazel; in view of this it is impossible to understand Azazel as in any way designating the goat itself, so that the interpretation of the LXX. Vulg. and A. V. is untenable as a literal translation, although as a paraphrase, it very well expresses the sense. On the other hand, this by no means implies, as so often assumed, that Azazel must be a personal being. It would be perfectly consonant to the usage of language that one goat should be for the LORD, and the other for anything, or place, or "abstraction;" for the knife, for the wilderness, for the bearing away of sin. (5) The word Azazel is elsewhere unknown to the Scriptures, and there is no satisfactory evidence that, except as taken from this passage, it ever was a word known to any language. (6) Finally it is to be borne in mind that this is not the only case in which two victims, treated with different ritual, constituted together a single sin offering. The same thing occurred in the two birds of the sin offering of the poor (v. 7–10), of which one was treated according to the ritual of the sin offering, and the other according to that of the burnt offering, yet both together constituted the sin offering. Another analogy is in the two birds for the purification of the leprous man or house, one killed, the other set free. These last, however, were not a sacrifice.

In view of these facts why may it not be supposed that the word Azazel was somewhat vague and indeterminate in its signification to the ancient Israelites themselves, just as *Redemption* is to the Christian? So far as our sinful condition is concerned, nothing can be plainer or more vitally important; but when the question is asked, "To whom is this redemption paid?" no certain and satisfactory answer has been, or can be given. May it not have been in the same way with this word to the Israelites? That their sins were borne away was most clearly taught; but looking upon these sins as concrete realities, the question might arise, "Whither were they carried?" The answer is in the first place to the wilderness, "to the place of banishment from God;" and then further to Azazel. It was not necessary that the word should be clearly understood; in fact the more vague its meaning, the more perfect the symbolism. The typical system could not explain further. The main point is well brought out in the translations of the LXX., the Vulg. and the A. V., After every other part of the atonement for the holy places had been completed (ver. 20) this goat was appointed for the symbolic bearing away of the sins of the people, first into the wilderness, a wide, indefinite place, and then further to Azazel, a wide, indefinite word. All this very emphatically symbolized to the people the utter removal

of the burden of their sins, without attempting to define precisely what became of them. The only danger that could be supposed of similar vagueness entered into the New Testament account of the great Sacrifice for sins, to set at rest the endless theories which aim in vain at explaining the *modus operandi* of the Divine atonement—except that whatever that term had been, learning and ability would have been hopelessly devoted to ascertain its meaning, as has already been the case with Azazel. —F. G.]

"After the atoning sacrifice was completed in the way described, Aaron must prepare to present the burnt offering. It is very significant that he had to lay aside in the court the linen garments, the garments of expiation, and bathe his flesh with water, and then only, in his own high-priestly robes, present his burnt offering and that of the people, a ram for himself, and a ram for the people. Moreover, when it is said, he shall both **make an atonement for himself, and for the people** (ver. 24), it is certainly implied in the expression that the typical burnt offering signified only a typical *Fuerum* for the real Burnt offering (Rom. xii. 1), provided the expression is not to be considered as a final recapitulation. The contrast between the he-goat which had been slain as a sin offering to Jehovah, and the goat of the Azazel is also expressed in this: that the fat of the first came upon the altar with the burnt offering, while even the man who drove away the Azazel goat had to undergo a lustration." [Aaron's bathing himself (ver. 24) seems also to be connected with his having symbolically laid the sins of the people upon the head of the goat. The same lustration was also required of him who burnt the flesh of the other goat and of the bullock without the camp (ver. 28), as is noticed by Lange below. The object of these requirements is evidently to express by every possible symbolism the defiling nature of sin. In ver. 27 the word for burning is שָׂרַף, which as noted under iv. 12, is never used of sacrificial burning.—F. G.] "The sin offerings indeed, the bullock and the goat, in their remainder of skin, flesh and bones, were carried without the camp, and there burned; as was to be done with the sin offerings of the high-priest and of the congregation according to ch. iv. 1-21, as if these pieces were considered a *Cherem*." [The law required that the flesh of all sin offerings whose blood was brought within the sanctuary, should be burned without the camp. See on x. 18.—F. G.] "But it has certainly this meaning: that these pieces were here neutralized and removed with a becoming reverence for their signification. On account of this important idea, the fulfiller of this work was also subjected to a lustration, ver. 28."

"As a supplement, partly a repetition, it is now said, that the children of Israel shall on this day afflict their souls; that this law shall be an everlasting law; the day a great Sabbath on which all work shall be stopped; that it shall be Israel's atonement from all their sins which the high-priest should execute, and that once a year. It also remains not unnoticed that the ordinance in regard to this was observed at that time.

"For the literature, see Keil, p. 113, 14," *etc.* [Trans. page 398. See also the authorities in Smith's *Bib. Dict.* art. *Atonement, Day of*, and in Winer, art. *Versöhnungstag*.—F. G.]

[Ver. 29. **In the seventh month** of the ecclesiastical year, which according to Josephus (I. 3, § 3), was the first of the civil year. The old Hebrew name for this month was *Ethanim*, the post-captivity name *Tisri*. On the first day of this month was appointed the Feast of Trumpets (xxiii. 24), celebrated as a Sabbath and by "an holy convocation;" on the tenth was the great Day of Atonement, provided for in this chapter, and again mentioned xxiii. 26-32; and on the fifteenth day began the feast of tabernacles, lasting for a week (xxiii. 33-43). The deportment required of the people on the Day of Atonement is more fully expressed in ch. xxiii. Here it is simply described as a day in which **ye shall afflict your souls**, *i. e.* humble yourselves to penitence and humiliation. This would of course include fasting; but the distinctive word for fasting, צוֹם or תַּעֲנִית, so common afterwards, does not occur in the Pentateuch or Joshua. It was further provided that the people should **do no work at all**, not merely no servile work, as was provided for on various other occasions, but absolutely no work. And this ordinance was extended to the **stranger that sojourneth among you**. Various laws were made obligatory upon the stranger, as the observance of the fourth commandment, Ex. xx. 10; the abstinence from blood, Lev. xvii. 10; certain laws of sexual purity, xviii. 26; the law against giving of one's seed to Molech, xx. 2; and against blasphemy, xxiv. 16. These were all laws so essential to the Hebrew theocracy that every one who came within the sphere of their exercise was bound to respect them. They apply to every one staying for however long or short a time within the bounds of Israel, and it is a mistake to restrict them (Clark) to those of other races permanently domiciled among the Israelites, as will at once appear from a consideration of the character of several of these laws. Ver. 34. **He did as the LORD commanded Moses**, *i. e.* in announcing the law. Perhaps also the expression may include the observance of the day when the time came round which could only have been several months later, the Israelites having departed from Mount Sinai on the twentieth day of the second month (Num. x. 11), while all the legislation in Leviticus was given during their sojourn there (ch. xxvi. 46; xxvii. 34).—F. G.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The vail shutting out the Holy of Holies set forth, in speaking symbol, the unapproachableness and unknowableness of God. Even the high priest, entering once in the year, must obscure his view in the very cloud of incense with which he approached. The same truth

was more feebly taught in the arrangements of the heathen temples, and was set forth in the speculations of heathen philosophy. In the Jewish Scriptures it is declared with the utmost emphasis and clearness. In the New Testament too, we are taught that He can be revealed to man only by Him who is both God and man. Thus the latest conclusion of modern philosophy, that behind all that can be discovered of nature there is an "Unknowable," a "power inscrutable to the human intellect" is taught in Scripture from beginning to end. Even when the vail was rent asunder at the crucifixion of Christ, and a new and living way was consecrated for us into the holy of holies, it became a way to the knowledge and apprehension of God rather practically and spiritually than intellectually. The finite and the Infinite can meet only in Him who is both.

II. The high-priest was warned to enter within the vail only in the way and at the time prescribed, **lest he die.** His official and symbolic holiness did not make him personally holy, so that he could bear to enter as he pleased the presence of the holy God, but only covered his official service. This was not prevented or rendered unavailing by his own personal unworthiness. So here is taught the great principle that "the unworthiness of ministers hinders not the effect of the sacraments;" that the grace of God accompanies the acts of those whom He has appointed in that which He has given them to do, although this treasure be placed "in earthen vessels."

III. The dress of Aaron when he passed within the vail was evidently significant. Ordinarily, when he ministered as high-priest and in the presence of the people, his robes were of the utmost splendor, symbolizing his high office as the typical mediator between God and the congregation; but now in the highest act of that mediation, when alone before God, these are to be laid aside, and the whole purpose of the dress is to symbolize that perfect purity with which only he may enter the presence of the immediate dwelling-place of God.

IV. In Aaron's first offering of a sin offering for himself is very strongly set forth the imperfection of the Levitical law. The one on whose mediation the people must depend for forgiveness must yet first make propitiation for himself. And in the provision for the annual repetion of this day, its insufficiency is apparent, see Heb. x. 1-3. Here then again, as so constantly in every part of its provisions, the law of sacrifice proclaims itself as but a temporary institution until that which is perfect should come.

V. By the goat for Azazel again, the same thing is taught. "It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" (Heb. x. 4); therefore after all symbolism had been exhausted in the sacrifice of bulls and of goats, the sins were yet laid upon the head of the goat for Azazel, and sent away into the wilderness. The sins thus sent away are not to be looked upon as different sins from those for which propitiation was offered, nor as a residue of these unatoned for; but as the same sins, as all the sins of the children of Israel (ver. 21). Atonements had been made for these throughout the year; a further and higher atonement had at this moment been made; but that all these were inherently ineffectual was now shown by the goat for Azazel.

VI. The Christian Fathers, with that instinct which often seizes upon a truth without recognizing accurately the process by which it is reached, generally considered the goat for Azazel as a type of Christ, some of them in one way, some in another. Cyril thought him a type of the risen Christ, and the wilderness to which he was sent, a type of heaven. Theodoret makes him a type of the Divine nature of Christ, which was necessary to the perfection of His atonement, and yet incapable of suffering. The type seems really to consist in this: that the sins for which all the Levitical sacrifices were unable really to atone, were symbolically borne away by the goat; even as our iniquities are truly laid upon Christ, and He has borne them away. Isa. liii. 4–6.

VII. The incense formed a prominent and essential part of the ritual of the day of atonement. This is not to be forgotten in its relation to the antitype. It is not on Christ's sacrifice alone that we depend for the forgiveness of our sins, but upon His intercession also.

VIII. On the day of atonement no work whatever was to be done: the propitiation for sin was not only the paramount duty, taking the place of everything that interfered with it; but it was to be all-absorbing. The people had no duties to perform directly in connection with the service of atonement; but still they must do no work. The propitiation for sin must be the one thing on that day done in all the camp of Israel; and meanwhile the whole congregation were to "afflict their souls." Though the propitiation of sins be wrought *for* us, and not by us, yet must it bring to us the lowliness and humiliation of repentance.

IX. Aaron was to make an atonement (ver. 20) for the holy of holies, for the tabernacle, and for the altar; but these had already been sanctified at their first consecration, and the atonement now made must be perpetually repeated year by year. It is plain from this that there was no effective remedy for the inherent weakness and sinfulness of man, which contaminated even his most holy things, until the coming of that Son of man who should be without sin. The high-priest entered the holy of holies, and thus approached the symbolic dwelling-place of God; but he did not thereby open the way to others, or even to himself except for this same typical entrance, "the Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the Holiest of all was not yet made manifest" (Heb. ix. 8); the only atonement which could really open the way for man to heaven itself must be offered before the throne of Jehovah by Him who alone could offer an all-sufficent sacrifice for the sin of the world.

X. "The rites were not in any proper sense supplemental, but were a solemn gathering up, as it were, of all other rites of atonement, so as to make them point more expressively to the revelation to come of God's gracious purpose to man, in sending His Son to be delivered for our offences, and to rise again for our justification

to be our great High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec, and to enter for us within the vail (Rom. iv. 25; Heb. vi. 20). The day of atonement expanded the meaning of every sin offering, in the same way as the services for Good Friday and Ash Wednesday expand the meaning of our Litany days throughout the year, and Easter Day, that of our Sundays." Clark.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

The day of atonement "forms a contrast to the defilement of the sanctuary by the sons of Aaron, their rash intrusion, their strange fire, their moral death and fearful destruction. (Ch. xvi. 1). It depends—as far as concerns the understanding—upon a great dread, a great world-historic preparation, and earnest religious prayers and actions. It is performed for the whole people, and this means for all humanity. But it points also, by its several particulars out from the Old Testament and into the New. The high-priest is not yet clean, not yet the righteous; he must first offer for himself (see the Ep. to the Heb.). He is not one with his sacrifice and sacrificial blood, although he must represent the approximation to this unity in the disrobing himself of his high-priestly majesty. But even the sin offering availed only for sins of weakness (xxiv. 16; Num. xv. 30), and not for sins of malice, of rebellion, of outrage with a high hand. These were everywhere, when they were discovered, punished with death. But since all were not discovered, a deadly sin steals through the life of Israel, and accumulates—as a token of which the goat of the sin offering is sent, through the goat of the Azazel, into the wilderness as a curse offering to the author of the demon-like sin." [The same application may be made of the different views given of the sins borne away by the goat, and of Azazel in the Exegetical.—F. G.]. "Thus the law lightens the darkest night-side of Israel and of the human race. But Christ has shown the chain and tradition of these secret faults in His denunciation, Matt. xxiii. 30 ss., and Paul has shown (Rom. iii.) how Christ, before the tribunal of God, has also atoned for these hitherto inexpiable sins (on the distinction between *πάρεσις* and *ἄφεσις* see Cocceius), and has moreover no scruple in declaring that Christ also has become a curse offering for us (Gal. iii. 13)." [The *κατάρα* of Gal. iii. 13 may well be compared with the *ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν* of 2 Cor. v. 21. It cannot possibly denote that Christ became a "curse offering" in the sense which Lange attributes to the Azazel-goat (although something approaching even this view of the atonement was held in Christian antiquity. See Oxenham's *Cath. doct. of the Atonement*, 2d ed., pp. 114–124); but rather means that he took upon Himself the curse which belonged to us.—F. G.]. "The New Testament atonement is indeed conditioned on faith in its objective application to individual men, *although in its universal objective force it is absolutely unconditioned.* Of itself also, the shadowy representative of this great future atonement produced in Israel a calm, thankful, and festive disposition, the foundation for the joyous feast of Tabernacles. The Old Testament sanctuary itself, in all its parts (ver. 33), was again expiated and cleansed, in a typical way, by this atonement. As the ground for this lies the thought: that without such purifications from time to time, a priestly institution is in danger of sinking into the deepest and most corrupting corruption. The acts for sanctifying the holy people extend to the end of ch. xvi.; in ch. xvii. follow the sacred observances." Lange.

The congregation of Israel were wholly excluded from even the typical holy of holies, yet were they required to be holy; when on one day of the year their high-priest passed within the vail, they must "afflict their souls" and do no manner of work; but for us, our Great High-Priest has passed within the vail, and opened a new and living way for us to follow; "let us then draw near with a true heart" (Heb. x. 22). The hope of thus entering the true holy of holies at the end of his pilgrimage brings with it to the Christian a closer communion with God on his journey thither; for that is not reserved for the end, but in spirit even now he has "boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus" (*ib.* 19). Only all depends upon the Propitiation which the day of atonement typified.

The fearful contagion of sin is shown by the purification of those who had to do with the propitiation for sin; even Aaron must bathe himself and change his robes, and the men who took charge of the two goats of the sin offering, who led into the wilderness the one for Azazel, or burnt the flesh of the one slain in sacrifice, must wash their clothes and bathe their flesh before they could return to the camp. Hereby is shadowed forth the exceeding pollution of sin.

The sacrifices of this day were performed by the high-priest alone, and especially when he made atonement for the holy places no man might be within the court. "Thus the high-priest prefigured Christ, who accomplished the work of atonement 'alone, and of the people there was none with Him; His own arm brought salvation' (Isa. lxiii. 5)." Wordsworth.

The holy of holies was never entered by anyone except at this time; yet (ver. 16) atonement must be made for it **because of the uncleanness of the children of Israel.**—Upon this Calvin (in ver. 16) remarks, "Moses distinctly says that the sanctuary must be purified not from its own uncleannesses, but from those of the children of Israel. Now the reality of this figure is to be regarded for our advantage. God appears to us in His only Begotten Son through baptism and the holy supper: these are the pledges of our sanctification: but such is our corruption that we do not cease, as far as in us lies, to profane these instruments of the Spirit, by which God sanctifieth us. But since no flocks may be slain, it becomes us to mourn, and earnestly to pray that our uncleanness, by which baptism and the holy supper are vitiated, Christ may wash away and cleanse by the sprinkling of His own blood."

BOOK II.

OF CONTINUANCE IN COMMUNION WITH GOD.

CHAPTERS XVII.—XXVI.

"The keeping holy of the consecrated relations of the life of Israel, of the whole round of sacrifice, and of the round of typical holiness, by the putting aside of the sins of obduracy (Cherem). CHAPS. XVII.—XXVII."—LANGE.

PART I. HOLINESS ON THE PART OF THE PEOPLE.

CHAPS. XVII.—XX.

FIRST SECTION.

"The keeping holy of all animal slaughter as the basis of all sacrifice, of the blood as the soul of all sacrifice, and of animal food as the foundation of all food, of all feasting."—LANGE.

Holiness in Regard to Food.

CHAPTER XVII. 1–16.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them: This *is* the thing
3 which the LORD hath commanded, saying, What man soever *there be* of the house of Israel[1] that killeth an ox, or lamb [sheep[2]], or goat, in the camp, or that killeth
4 *it* out of the camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation, to offer an offering unto the LORD before the tabernacle [the dwelling place[3]] of the LORD;[4] blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath
5 shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people: to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer [sacrifice[5]] in the open field, even that they may bring them unto the LORD, unto the door of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation, unto the priest, and offer them *for* peace
6 offerings unto the LORD. And the priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the LORD *at* the door of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation, and burn

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 3. The LXX. here, as in the text in vers. 8, 10, inserts the clause *or of the strangers which sojourn among you.*

[2] Ver. 3. כֶּשֶׂב. See Textual Note [5] on iii. 7.

[3] Ver. 4. מִשְׁכַּן. See Textual Note [8] on xv. 31. There is especial reason for a change in the rendering here as the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד has just occurred in the previous clause.

[4] Ver. 4. This ver. is largely interpolated in the Sam. and LXX. "to offer a burnt offering or a peace offering [for your atonement *Sam.*] acceptable unto the Lord for an odor of a sweet savor. And whosoever shall kill without, and shall not bring it to the door of the tabernacle of testimony, that he may offer an offering to the Lord before the tabernacle of the Lord; blood shall be," *etc.* The purpose of this interpolation is supposed to be to bring this passage into harmony with Deut. xii. 25; but the difficulty, if any can be considered to exist, is not avoided by this repetition.

[5] Ver. 5. וְזִבְחֵיהֶם אֲשֶׁר הֵם זֹבְחִים. The same word occurring twice in the same clause should surely have the same translation. זָבַח is the technical word for killing in sacrifice, and although in the later books it is rarely used for slaughtering in the more general sense, it is never applied in the Pentateuch to anything else than sacrifice. See preliminary note on sacrifice. It cannot, therefore (with Clark) be here taken of simply slaughtering for food.

7 the fat for a sweet savour unto the LORD. And they shall no more offer [sacrifice[5]]
their sacrifices unto devils [demons[6]], after whom they have gone a whoring. This
shall be a statute for ever unto them throughout their generations.
8 And thou shalt say unto them, Whatsoever man *there be* of the house of Israel,
or of the strangers which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt offering or sacri-
9 fice, and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle of the [*om.* the] congregation
to offer it unto the LORD; even that man shall be cut off from among his people.
10 And whatsoever man *there be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that so-
journ among you, that eateth any manner of blood; I will even set my face against
11 that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the
life [soul[7]] of the flesh *is* in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar
to make an atonement for your souls: for it *is* the blood *that* maketh an atonement
12 for [by means of[8]] the soul. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul
of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat
blood.
13 And whatsoever man *there be* of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that
sojourn among you, which hunteth and catcheth any beast[8a] or fowl that may be
14 eaten; he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust. For *it is*
the life [of it *is* the soul[8]] of all flesh: the blood of it *is* for the life [soul[7]] thereof:
therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall eat the blood of no manner
of flesh: for the life [soul[9]] of all flesh *is* the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it
shall be cut off.
15 And every soul that eateth that which died *of itself*, or that which was torn *with*
beasts, whether it be one of your own country, or a stranger, he shall both wash his
clothes, and bathe *himself* in water, and be unclean until the even: then shall he
16 be clean. But if he wash *them* not, nor bathe his flesh; then he shall bear his
iniquity.

[6] Ver. 7. לַשְּׂעִירִם *lit.* to *buck-goats*. See Exeg. The A. V. has, however, undoubtedly expressed the sense, except that here, as frequently in the New Testament and sometimes in the Old (as in the translation of the same word in 2 Chron. xi. 15), it uses the plural *devils;* but one διάβολος is recognized in Scripture, and evil spirits in the plural are expressed by δαίμονες or δαιμόνια. It is better therefore to substitute *demons*. Vulg. *dæmones*, LXX. ματαίοι. In the A. V. in Isa. xiii. 21 and xxxiv. 14 it is rendered *Satyrs*.

[7] Vers. 11 and 14. נֶפֶשׁ is here equivalent to ψυχή and is so rendered in the LXX. In English the *life* of the A. V. may be understood in the same way, but so also may *soul*, and it is better in this very important passage to keep a uniform rendering of the Heb. word. All the ancient versions retain the same rendering throughout, so do several modern versions and almost all recent expositors.

[8] Ver. 11. יְכַפֵּר בַּנֶּפֶשׁ = maketh an atonement by means of the soul. "בְּ with כִּפֶּר has only a local or instrumental signification (ch. vi. 23; xvi. 17, 27; also vii. 7; Ex. xxix. 33; Num. v. 8). Accordingly, it was not the blood as such, but the blood as the vehicle of the soul, which possessed expiatory virtue." Keil, following Knobel. Similarly Bähr, Kurtz, and others. So also Von Gerlach and Clark. The A. V. is singularly infelicitous in that it refers the final נֶפֶשׁ to the soul of man, instead of to the soul of the victim; nevertheless, it follows the LXX., the Targums, and the Vulg.; and so also Luther. [8a] Ver. 13. See note[1] on xi. 2.

[9] Ver. 14. Comp. ver. 11. נֶפֶשׁ occurs three times in this verse, each time rendered in the A. V. *life*, but the uniform translation *soul* is better. In the expression **the blood of it is the soul thereof**, "בְּנַפְשׁוֹ is to be taken as a predicate in its meaning, introduced with *beth essentiale*. It is only as so understood that the clause supplies a reason at all in harmony with the context." Keil. With this most modern commentators concur, as well as the ancient and several recent versions.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The whole of Lange's "Exegetical" is here given. "1. With our chapter begins the second half of the Book of Leviticus. The book as a whole treats of the priestly presentation of the typical holiness of Israel, of the people of the holy Jehovah. In the first part, ch. i.–xvi., the various forms of the purification or sanctification of the impure and unholy people are set forth; in the second part, from ch. xvii. to the end, the various ways of keeping holy the people and their common life are now prescribed, and that too by the punishment of Cherem, as far as the profanations are wittingly committed (with uplifted hand). Profanations from impulse, on the other hand, must place the backsliding Israelite under the law of purification, which has found its culmination in the holiness of Israel through the great sacrifice of atonement.

"How much this organic completeness of the whole book can be mistaken, Knobel shows most remarkably when he says: 'The section has, in its expression, much in common with the Elohist, but yet it cannot have come from him, since (*a*) he would have attached it to ch. i.–vii., where it fits best (!); or, on account of ver. 15, at least to ch. xi.–xv.; but would not have placed it here, beyond the law of the Day of Atonement, *etc.*'"

[This chapter, like all the Divine communications in the remainder of Leviticus, is addressed to Moses; indeed this is the case throughout

the whole book, except when Moses and Aaron are addressed together in regard to acts which depended upon an exercise of priestly judgment, and also except the single instance (x. 8–11) in which the prohibition of the priestly use of strong drink is addressed to Aaron alone. Still, several of these communications to Moses are to be immediately communicated by him, as in the present chapter, **unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel**, as alike binding upon them all. A slight difference in the arrangement of this portion of Leviticus is occasioned by treating the concluding chapter (xxvii.) as an appendix, which seems to be required by the formula of conclusion at the end of ch. xxvi. The other ten chapters are arranged as follows: xvii.–xx., holiness in matters which concern the people generally, the last chapter (xx.) being occupied chiefly with the punishments for the violation of this holiness; xxi., xxii., holiness in matters concerning the priests and offerings; xxiii.—xxv., sanctification of the various feasts, including also that of the holy lamps and shew-bread (xxiv. 1-9), and a short historical section giving the account of the punishment of a blasphemer (xxiv. 10–23); xxvi. forms the conclusion of the whole book, consisting of promises and threats; and to this is added an appendix (xxvii.) on vows. This portion of the law of Leviticus is arranged, therefore, in the same systematic way as the former portion, and the two parts stand also in systematic relation to one another. "As the former part relates to the birth of the nation as a spiritual commonwealth, so the present part relates to the progress of their social life as the people of God." Murphy. Necessarily there are details common to both portions, and this sometimes occasions certain slight repetitions; but such repetitions were unavoidable if the systematic character of the legislation above pointed out was to be preserved. Thus the present chapter, on a superficial view, might seem as Knobel has suggested, to be connected with the law of sacrifice; but on examination it will be at once seen that the subject here is the sanctification of animal food, and to this sacrifice, although generally necessary, is only incidental. Or, as Knobel also suggests, it might seem to be connected with the laws of clean and unclean food of ch. xi.; but the purpose is wholly different,—there the question is *what* may be eaten; here, *how* it shall be eaten. In both cases, the former chapters have for their main point, the laying down of the conditions under which Israel may enter into communion with God; these that follow deal with the conduct of the daily life, by means of which they may continue in that communion. The eating of animal food naturally comes first into consideration, as the act which must be continually repeated and continually thrust upon the attention.—F. G.].

"2. Our section begins with the most intimately connected ways of preserving holiness: (*a*) of the slaying, (*b*) of the blood, (*c*) of the use of the flesh.

"3. Every slaying of a clean animal designed for food must take place **before the door of the tabernacle of congregation** quite without exception, whether the slayer was within or without the camp. That is every slaying of an animal was put in relation with the peace offering, and thus also was a sort of sacrifice." [It does not appear from the text that the *slaying* itself took place at the door of the tabernacle, but only the *offering*, as in the case of all other sacrifices. The animal was probably slain where the other victims were slain, this being passed over in the text as already provided for in the law of sacrifice. These slayings for food were in every particular, not merely like, but actual peace offerings, unless a distinction should be sought in the fact that there is here no especial provision for giving a portion to the priests; but that, like the place of slaying, has already been provided for in the law of sacrifice. That the meaning of this passage is, that all sacrificial animals killed for food must first be offered as victims in sacrifice, is plain from the removal of the restriction in Deut. xii. 15, 20, 21. It is also shown by the use of שָׁחַט instead of זָבַח in ver. 3, a distinction carefully observed in the *killeth* of the A. V. From S. Augustine and Theodoret down, however, there has always been a difference of opinion upon this point among interpreters; most modern commentators, however (as Rosenmüller, Knobel, Keil, Kalisch, Clark, *etc.*) agree that the law must relate to all killing of animals for food. Not much animal food was used in the wilderness, as is evidenced by the various murmurings of the people, the manna forming their chief support. It is to be remembered that this part of the law, as far as ver. 7, is made obligatory only upon the Israelites, and even for them was in force only during the life in the wilderness; while the rest of the chapter includes also "the stranger" in its requirements.—F. G.]. "The offering, indeed, consisted in this, that the animal was brought to the Tabernacle of congregation, and placed before the priest, and that the priest sprinkled the blood of the same on the altar, and burned **the fat for a sweet savour.** The same rule was obligatory for the strangers not of Israel, if they wished not only to slay, but with their slaying to bring also a burnt or peace offering—they might offer only before the door of the tabernacle of congregation; for the public worship of false gods was forbidden in Israel (Ex. xxiii. 32, 33)." [This law, in regard to sacrificing, is made obligatory upon **the strangers**, as well as upon **the house of Israel** in vers. 8, 9; but the previous part of the law (vers. 1-7) applies only to the Israelites. Both were restrained from offering sacrifices elsewhere; but only the latter were obliged to make offerings of all animals slain for food.—F. G.] "The opposite, which was at the same time to be avoided by the Israelites, reads thus: **they shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices to the he-goats** (Luther: the field-devils), as to those which they who are in the snare whore after. Thus we understand the expression in reference to this, not as a reproach: which they whore after hitherto, or are inclined to whore after." [The Heb. is אֲשֶׁר הֵם זֹנִים אַחֲרֵיהֶם, which seems sufficiently well expressed in the A. V., and this is sustained (either in the

present or the past tense) by all the ancient versions.—F. G.] "Rightly the Egyptian worship of the he goat was remembered, which was a deification of the generative desire, and consequently of sensuality, and the biblical expression **to whore after** applies in this connection with double force. It can thus be perceived that the offering of the slain flesh, besides the religious idea, had also the moral purpose of hindering unrestrained luxury. But with the sacrifice of the slain animal, the fact was at the same time declared, that in truth every animal enjoyed in the fear of God was offered to the Lord; that the man who must offer himself to Jehovah must also place his slaying of an animal under the aspect of giving it up to Jehovah, if he wished to keep it holy. Therefore also the transgression is treated as a blood-guiltiness, and would be visited upon them by Jehovah as a murder. Since man has the right to shed the blood of an animal only from Jehovah, and in relation to Jehovah (to whom everything, with this, must revert as a sacrifice), a reckless slaying of an animal appears in the text as the beginning of a criminal blood-shedding, which on a descending path, may end in the murder of man." [Vers. 1-7. Ver. 4. **Blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood.** This does not mean that murder is to be imputed to the offender, but that the blood of the animal which he has actually shed is to be reckoned to his charge. The reason of both this precept and that against the eating of blood is given in ver. 11: Blood had been divinely appointed as a means of atonement. If now the animal slain was one allowable for sacrifice, and its blood was not used for atonement, the offender was guilty of a misuse of that which God had appointed for this purpose, and he must be held responsible for the wasted blood. By analogy, the blood of animals that were not sacrificial (vers. 13, 14) must also be treated with respect. It is important to note this meaning of the passage, for nowhere in Scripture is anything ever said to be imputed to a man by God which does not really belong to him.—**That man shall be cut off from among his people.**—The slighting of the Divinely appointed means of atonement was a sin which struck so deeply at the root of the theocratic and typical law that it was inconsistent with membership among the holy people. The offender must be excommunicated. Ver. 5. A further reason is here given for the law of ver. 4. It is only applied to peace offerings, for this was the only kind of sacrifice that could be used by the people for food, the subject of this paragraph. This reason is further developed in ver. 7. It would seem that the Israelites, very lately come out of Egypt, were more or less in the habit, so common among all nations of antiquity (comp. 1 Cor. viii.; x. 25-28), of consecrating all animal food by first offering the animal to the Deity; and this custom, if allowed to be carried out by the people at their own pleasure, would become, and indeed had already become (ver. 7) a fruitful source of idolatry. Entirely to cut off this, it is provided that all such offerings must be brought first **unto the door of the tabernacle**, the place of the sole worship of Jehovah; and second, **unto the priest**, as His representative, and the mediator between Him and the people. The custom of sacrificing **in the open field** also prevailed among the nations of classic antiquity, and was so inveterate among the Israelites as to be spoken of by both Hosea (xii. 11) and Jeremiah (xiii. 27). Ver. 7. **Unto demons.**—The Hebrew word, as noted under Textual, is the same as that for *he-goats*, שְׂעִירִים. Onkelos has שֵׁדִין, the same word as is used in Deut. xxxii. 17, meaning **demons.** It is doubtful whether the word is used of an actual worship of a false god under the form of a goat, or only figuratively. Certainly at a later date there was in Thmuis, the capital of the Mendesian *nome* in lower Egypt, and therefore near the residence of the Israelites, a horrible and licentious worship of the fertilizing principle in nature, represented by a he-goat (Joseph. c. Ap. ii. 7; Herod. ii. 42, 46; Diod. Sic. i. 18; Strabo, lib. xvii. c. 19, 802; c. 40, 813); it may be doubted whether this, in its full development, existed as early as the time of Moses; but very likely it may have already been known in its germ, and have been communicated to the Israelites (comp. Hengstenberg Eg. and the Books of Moses, Am. Ed., p. 216). The strong tendency of the Israelites to adopt idolatrous forms of worship borrowed from Egypt had already been shown in the instance of the golden calf; and we find again (2 Chron. xi. 15) this very worship of the he-goat (A. V. *devils*) mentioned along with the calves of Jeroboam, who had sojourned so long in Egypt before ascending his throne.—**This shall be a statute forever** does not refer to the sacrificing of animals designed for food, which was revoked with the termination of the life in the wilderness; but to the worship of demons, which is the immediate subject.—F. G.]

"Knobel thinks this **statute forever** was abolished later, when the animals were no longer brought to the Tabernacle or to the Temple; but the principal thought is the consecration to Jehovah, the religious slaying, and in this the statute (the husk of an idea) remains among the Jews continually, even to this day. But the idea itself remains continually in the Christian community. From this type it follows also that that use of animal food was sacrilegious in which the distinction between the nature of man and of animals was obliterated."

"4. Most solemnly is the use of blood forbidden. There follows immediately the menace of punishment in the strongest terms for the stranger as well as for the Israelite: **I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people** [ver. 10]. The reason is this: the soul or life of the flesh, its soul-like life-principle, is in the blood. But the blood belongs, as does all life, to Jehovah, and He has given it to the Israelites only for a definite purpose, that they may with it atone for, or cover, their souls. The blood is the atonement for the life, since in the blood the life is given over to the judgment of Jehovah for deliverance and for pardon. Therefore the prohibition is here repeated, as it has also been already expressed.

Even to the blood of beasts that man slays in the chase, to the very birds, this prohibition applies, although this blood was not offered; it was to be poured out and covered with earth—it was to be buried. The burial is generally analogous to the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar, as the earth is an altar in the widest sense—it is a symbol of the atonement of the life, which lies in the resignation of the life. As physiology confirms the proposition that the blood is the especial source of life in living creatures, so do justice and the philosophy of religion confirm the proposition that death atones for the guilt of life—so far as it is on this side of death (Rom. vi. 7). And the use of blood must appear wicked as long as blood was the means of atonement. But the analogue for this guilt, for all times, is the making common of life, of death, of blood, the self-willed invasion of the destiny of man." [Vers. 10-14. Lange has not here called attention especially to vers. 8, 9, which show that the **stranger** was allowed to offer both the **burnt offering** and the **sacrifice** (*i. e.* the peace offering); only in so doing he must conform to the law in offering it at the door of the tabernacle. This command is given here because the previous statute being only applicable to the Israelite, and the stranger not being required to offer as sacrifices the animals he might kill for food, he might have claimed the liberty also of offering sacrifices at his own pleasure. The penalty of ver. 9, since it applies equally to the stranger, cannot be restricted to excommunication, but must be understood either of banishment from the land or else of the punishment of death. The object, as already noticed, and as is evident from the amplification of the law in Deut. xii., was at once to prevent idolatrous sacrifices, and also to keep up the idea of the sacrifice as having only a typical and not an intrinsic efficacy, since it could only be allowed at all when its blood was sprinkled on the altar by the appointed priest. The other injunctions that follow in this chapter, equally with the present one, are applicable to strangers as well as Israelites. In ver. 10 the expression **set my face against** means that God will take the punishment of the offence into His own hands; He will oppose and reject the offender. In ver. 11 the vicarious character of the atonement effected by means of the sacrifices is very clearly brought out; the soul, the ψυχή, the principle of animal life, is in the blood, and for that reason the "soul" of animals was given to man to make an atonement for his own "soul;" by the giving up of the life of the animal the life of man was spared. Nothing is said here of the higher spiritual principle in man, because—even if the people could have understood such a distinction—there was nothing answering to this in the brute. Nothing in the victim could be a vicarious substitute for this; that want could be met only by the sacrifice of Calvary. Meantime, however, this was symbolized and set forth, as far as the nature of the case allowed, by the substitution of the animal life of the victim for the animal life of man. The blood, therefore, **maketh an atonement by means of the soul** which is in it. See Textual note 8. The statement is not here, that the blood makes atonement for the soul, as in the A. V.; this idea has already been expressed in the previous clause, and now is added the statement of how this is effected, lest there should seem to be a virtue in the mere blood itself as such. With this exposition of the meaning of the passage itself must be connected the whole typical significance of sacrifice; and in view of this there is truth in the explanation of Theodoret, of the Jewish expositors, and of the great mass of commentators, that the animal life of the victims was accepted in place of the rational soul of man; the former died that the latter might live. But that this sense can only be held in view of the connection of the type with the Antitype was long ago seen by St. Augustine (Quæst. 57 *in Hept.*). In ver. 13 the particular is put for the general; as during the life of the wilderness most animals used for food which were not sacrificial were taken in the chase, this stands for all such animals. But afterward (Deut. xii. 15, 16, 22-24) the same direction of pouring out the blood upon the earth is applied to all animals slain for food. The object of the command to cover the blood was probably double; first, simply to prevent the desecration of the blood as the vehicle of the animal soul; second, to avoid any abuse of it to superstitious and idolatrous uses. Ver. 14 once more repeats with emphasis the prohibition of the eating of the blood, and for the same reason—because the blood is the soul, *i. e.*, the vehicle of the animal life.—F. G.]

5. "The use of unclean flesh (ver. 15) could not be placed on an equality with the foregoing sins, since it might take place through many forms of thoughtlessness; but nevertheless it was prevented through the natural loathing. Hence the offender, in the first instance, fell only into the first grade of the law of purification; but if he neglected this, he had to make expiation for his misdeed.

"Keil (following Baumgarten) entitles the section chap. xvii.—xx. the holiness of the daily life of the Israelites, and chap. xvii. particularly the holiness of food. Certainly the sanctification of the eating of flesh leads to the sanctification of food generally. On 'the oneness of soul and blood,' see Keil, p. 126." [Trans. pp. 409–10. See also Clark's note II. at the end of this chapter. The prohibition of flesh that had not been properly slaughtered evidently rests on the fact that its blood had not been poured out. Still, as even in this case most of the blood would be collected in the larger vessels of the body, and would not appear as blood in the flesh that was eaten, there is less stringency in the prohibition. The defilement, however, was still considerable, and involved alike for the Israelite and the stranger, the washing of the clothes and the bathing of the person, and remaining unclean until the evening (ver. 15). **That which died of itself, or that which was torn**, are here classed together, as also in chap. xxii. 8. In Ex. xxii. 31 the latter is commanded to be given to the dogs, and in Deut. xiv. 21 the former is allowed to be given to the stranger, or sold to an alien. There appears to have been a certain degree of distinction between the two, although both are forbidden to the Israelite. That which died of itself was also forbidden to the stranger

during the intimate association of Israelite and stranger in the camp life of the wilderness, but this law was relaxed in Deuteronomy in view of the better separated life in the land of Canaan. Such food, however, was always considered polluting to the Israelite (Ez. iv. 14; xliv. 31), and its touch, as has already been seen (xi. 39) communicated defilement. At the council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 29) the prohibition of "things strangled" is still continued in connection with the prohibition of blood.—F. G.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The command that all sacrifices should be offered in one place was plainly a part of that educational law which had been added because of transgressions. There had been no such restriction laid upon the patriarchs; and under the law itself, it was often dispensed with by Divine command, or with the Divine approval, as in the case of Samuel, of David, of Solomon, and of Elijah. Its purpose was to teach symbolically the Divine unity, and to prevent the worship of false gods. When this lesson had been sufficiently taught came the hour "when neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem," men should "worship the Father" (Jno. iv. 21).

II. When the Israelites sacrificed otherwise than at the tabernacle, though the idols to which they professed to offer might be nothing, yet really they sacrificed to demons. So St. Paul teaches it was with the sacrifices of the heathen in his time (1 Cor. x. 19, 20), and he warns Christians that by partaking of those sacrifices they came into fellowship with demons, and this was incompatible with partaking of "the cup of the Lord." The same consequences must in all ages attend the offering of the homage of the heart elsewhere than to God.

III. This unfaithfulness to God is represented here, as so constantly in the later Scriptures, by conjugal infidelity. As husband and wife are no longer twain, but one flesh, so are the faithful united to their Head in one body, and any giving of superior allegiance to another is as the sin of marriage unfaithfulness.

IV. The blood and the soul, or animal life (נֶפֶשׁ), are here connected together, and the same word is used of the sacrifice of Christ, Isa. liii. 10, and the corresponding Greek word (ψυχή) repeatedly by our Lord Himself (Matt. xx. 28; Jno. x. 11, *etc.*). He gave His life (ψυχή) for us. In view of the connection established in this chapter between this and the blood, a fresh significance attaches to His words of institution of the Lord's Supper (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28). The drinking of the cup which He gave, is the communion in His sacrifice for the remission of sins.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "That animal food as used by man, was to be kept holy by a religious consecration and slaying, excludes the use of flesh that is unhallowed or has been offered to demons. Man was to have a feeling for the suffering of the animal, for the sacrificial particular of the act of slaying, for the religio-moral duty of thankful and moderate use of flesh. Hence there is an element of truth also in the dogma of the vegetarians. But all blood must be reserved as an offering to Jehovah; for Jehovah alone is the Author of life, the God of all souls, and it is a crime to encroach greedily upon His domain. But how does the eating of blood in Christendom agree with this, as the council of the Apostles (Acts xv.) have forbidden it, and as it is still forbidden in the Oriental Church? The New Testament thought is the holiness and inviolability of everything living *in itself*, since a creative breath of life dwells in it. If man, without an object, sheds blood or destroys life, he destroys the sanctuary of Divine goodness. The outline of the legal prescription disappears behind these thoughts. Men may be very careful, as in Byzantium and in Russia, to avoid the eating of blood, and still be in many ways criminally careless with life, even with the life of man. Connected with the eating of flesh, the eating of the flesh of an animal that has died of itself, or been torn by wild beasts, is also forbidden, even if in a slighter degree. In the fact that such a use of flesh has in itself something savage, and is a source of many sicknesses, lies the permanent thought of this legal command."

Calvin notes that the command to sacrifice in one place was to avoid corruption of the sacrifices, and the direction to bring the offering to the priest was to direct the people to the One Mediator to come. Thus everywhere the law is our school-master to point us to Christ. No offering acceptable to God can be offered except through Him, and all enjoyment of daily life must be made holy through His mediation.

God does not impute to man the fault which is not his; but the fault which is really his may be far more serious than he supposes. The killing of an animal otherwise than God allowed, was the shedding of blood—of blood which had been given for man's atonement; and so now, many sins which seem upon the surface mere sins of frivolity and thoughtlessness, will prove on closer examination to be deep offences against the love of Him who shed His blood for us on the cross.

Any offering of sacrifice otherwise than in the way of God's appointment, became to the Israelites a sacrificing to demons; so any giving to other objects of the supreme affection He requires for Himself, becomes to us idolatry. Comp. Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 5.

Strangers must in many respects come under the laws given to the people of God. Men do not escape the responsibility of obedience by refusing to acknowledge allegiance, and to be numbered with His people.

In the treatment of the blood of the wild animal is taught the general principle of congruity in matters which are not the subject of direct precepts. Man should order all his ways in harmony with the conduct which in certain things is directly commanded. Especially under the Christian dispensation is this principle of wide application. Here principles are given rather than detailed precepts, to guide our conduct, and we must largely be governed by the congruity and fitness of things, and their harmony with that which is commanded.

SECOND SECTION.

Holiness of the Marriage Relation.

Chapter XVIII.

"The keeping holy of marriage, of all sexual relations, and of all the relations of life in general."

Chapters XVIII.—XX.

A.—"THE KEEPING HOLY OF MARRIAGE AND OF ALL SEXUAL RELATIONS UNDER THE PENALTY OF THE CHEREM."—Lange.

Chapter XVIII.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

On the "Prohibited Degrees" and on the Marriage Laws of the Heathen.

The law declaring under what conditions sexual intercourse is forbidden is given in the present chapter; the punishment of disobedience in the several cases is declared in xx. 10-21. The latter is naturally less full, leaving the punishment in some instances to be inferred from analogy; and in one case it is considered by some commentators that there is a slight extension of the law here given. See on xx. 20. The law covers all sexual intercourse whether by formal marriage or by simple concubinage; and when the wives of various persons are mentioned, the term includes their wives when living, and their widows when they were themselves dead. It is remarkable that it makes no exception in favor of such marriages as had occurred among the ancestors of the Israelites, as in the case of Jacob, from which they were themselves descended. (The marriage of Abraham with Sarah was probably with his niece, the word *sister* allowing of this latitude).

The whole law is expressed in reference to the man, since the inception of such relations rests with him; but it would be a mistake to suppose that a precisely parallel list might be drawn up also for the woman. Differences are introduced by the law of the Levirate marriage (an institution much more ancient than the time of Moses, see Gen. xxxviii.), and by the general relation of protector and protected; the law therefore applies to the woman only in the case of those relationships in which the man is forbidden to have intercourse with her. Some of the degrees which are prohibited implicitly are not expressly mentioned: thus connection with a daughter is not mentioned by itself, although necessarily involved in the prohibition of intercourse with a woman and her daughter in ver. 17; that with a step-mother is included in ver. 8, and is especially mentioned as the subject of one of the curses in Deut. xxvii. 23; that with a grandmother is not mentioned at all, either because it was considered unnecessary to do so, or else because it was sufficiently implied by the other prohibitions. The whole law is expressly grounded (vers. 2, 3, 24–27) upon the duty of avoiding the abominable customs of the Egyptians and the Canaanites, so that there was the less necessity for express mention of anything which was not practised by them.

The principle on which the prohibitions rest (ver. 6) is expressly declared to be nearness of relationship; and although the Hebrew expression employed for this (*lit.* flesh of his flesh) might in itself apply only to blood relations, yet it is distinctly extended in the law to relations by affinity also, though not always to the same degree. In the remoter degrees the relationship is affected by other considerations, so that in parallel cases, sometimes one connection is forbidden while the other is not mentioned. Generally, the whole list might be included in the single prohibition that no man might be connected with a woman who stood, or who might come to stand to him in the position of a ward; no one who could be included in the family of which he was head. In this connection the LXX. translation in ver. 6 is to be noted: *ἄνθρωπος πρὸς πάντα οἰκεῖα σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ οὐ προσελεύσεται.* Such a description, however, would not be quite accurate, since the niece is not included in the list of prohibited degrees; and there are two prohibited cases which would not come under the description. These are the maternal aunt, who would form a part of the wife's father's or brother's family; and the wife's sister, forbidden only during the life-time of the wife.

The prohibited degrees may be conveniently arranged under the three following heads:

a. Relations by Blood.

1. Mother, ver. 7.
2. Aunt on either side, vers. 12, 13.
3. Sister and half sister, vers. 9, 11.
4. Daughter, ver. 17.
5. Grand-daughter, vers. 10.

b. Direct Relations by Affinity.

6. Mother-in-law, ver. 17.
7. Step-mother, ver. 8.
8. Step-daughter, ver. 17.
9. Step-grand-daughter, ver. 17.

c. Indirect Relations by Affinity.

10. Father's brother's wife, ver. 14.
11. Brother's wife, ver. 16.
12. Daughter-in-law, ver. 15.

In addition to these there is a temporary prohibition of the wife's sister during the wife's own life.

Among the heathen these relationships were very differently regarded. Marriage with a sister was permitted among the Egyptians by express law in consequence of the legend in their mythology of the marriage of Osiris with his sister Isis (Diod. Sic. i. 27; Philo de Sp. Legg. near beginning), and this custom continued, at least in the royal family, quite down to the time of their conquest by the Romans (Dio. Cass. xlii. p. 205, E. ed., Hanover, 1606). With regard to marriage with a mother, direct evidence is wanting in regard to the Canaanites, but among the Medes and the Persians it was practised from the earliest times, as also among the Indians and the Ethiopians. (See the authorities in Knobel), and all these nations appear to have permitted also marriage with a daughter. Marriage with a sister, however, was unknown among the Persians until the time of Cambyses, (Herod. iii. 31). Marriage with a step-mother seems to have been universal among Oriental monarchs, and the inheritance of the father's seraglio one of the marks of succession to his throne. Hence Solomon's treatment of Adonijah is to be explained when he sought to have Abishag given to him (1 Kings ii. 13-25). Marriage with a wife's step-mother, however, is not forbidden, and a notable instance of it is in David's inheriting the wives of his father-in-law Saul, spoken of as a mark of the Divine favor, 2 Sam. xii. 8.

The marriages here forbidden are spoken of as crimes in the Canaanites for which they were about to be punished. While it is not necessary to extend this to each particular, still it must be recognized that the prohibited degrees generally were such as could be understood by the light of nature or such dim tradition of the Divine will as might have been accessible to the Canaanites. Accordingly, it is well known that the prohibited degrees among the Greeks and Romans were for the most part the same as in the laws of Moses. Solon indeed permitted marriage with a half-sister by the father only, and Lycurgus with a half-sister by the mother only (Philo de Sp. Legg., pp. 601, F. Ed., Geneva, 1613); but the early Roman law went even farther than the Levitical in forbidding marriages between uncles and nieces, and between cousins german, which was only relaxed in the 2d cent. before our era (Liv. xlii. 34; Cic. *pro Cluent.* V. quoted by Clark). Similar laws, too, might be quoted from other nations, showing that those of the Egyptians and Canaanites were simply a license to passion, contrary to what they might have known to be right.

Marriage with a deceased wife's sister is clearly allowed under the Levitical law, not merely by not being prohibited; but being prohibited during the lifetime of the sister first taken to wife, it becomes doubly certain that it was permitted afterwards. It is even made still more clear by the reason assigned; the relations of two wives of the same man are not apt to be friendly, and Moses would not allow either that the natural affection of sisters should be subjected to this strain, or that the inevitable animosities of the harem should be increased by the previous familiar relation of sisters. On the other hand, the marriage with a brother's widow was forbidden, evidently because she became the ward of the surviving brother; and because also if the brother had died childless while she remained his wife, the survivor was bound to take her by a Levirate marriage. In either case her children were to be reckoned to the deceased brother, and hence the penalty for violating this precept in xx. 21 is that they shall be childless, *i. e.*, that any children born to such a union should be reckoned in the genealogies, not to them, but to the deceased brother. The law therefore in this case must be considered as based upon questions of civil polity and not upon affinity. Hence it does not apply to the parallel case of the deceased wife's sister; for she could never have formed a part of her brother-in-law's household under the family system of the Hebrews. In the punishments denounced in ch. xx. against the sins here prohibited, it will be found that a distinction is made in the degree of guilt. One, and the larger class, is to be capitally punished (in one case even the bodies of both parties are to be burnt), while in the other class the penalty is simply that "they shall be childless." It cannot be supposed that a perpetual miracle was to be maintained through all the ages of Israel's history; but the meaning evidently is that the children of such marriages should be reckoned not to their actual father, but to the former husband of the woman. In the strong feeling of the Israelites in regard to posterity, this penalty seems to have been sufficient. (An instance of this use of the word childless is to be found in Jer. xxii. 30 compared with 1 Chr. iii. 17, 18). It is not to be supposed that the more remote of the prohibited degrees were among the abominations for which the Canaanites were to be cut off; but on the other hand adultery and the other horrible sins mentioned in vers. 20-23 were undoubtedly among their customs.

Literature.—Michaelis, *Laws of Moses; Abhandlung über die Ehegesetze Mosis;* Saalschutz, *Mos. Recht;* Selden, *uxor ebr.* See also the numerous references in Calmet on this chapter. Also, John Fry, *The cases of marriage between near kindred, etc.* London, 1756.

Chapter XVIII. 1–30.

1, 2. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel,
3 and say unto them, I *am* the Lord your God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring[1] you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their ordi-
4 nances [statutes[2]]. Ye shall do my judgments, and keep mine ordinances [statutes[2]],
5 to walk therein: I *am* the Lord your God. Ye shall therefore keep [3]my statutes, and [3]my judgments: which if a man do, he shall live in them: I *am* the Lord.
6 None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin[4] to him, to uncover *their*
7 nakedness: I *am* the Lord. The nakedness of thy father, or [even[5]] the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she *is* thy mother; thou shalt not
8 uncover her nakedness. The nakedness of thy father's wife shalt thou not uncover:
9 it *is* thy father's nakedness. The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or daughter of thy mother, *whether she be* born[6] at home, or born abroad,
10 *even* their[7] nakedness thou shalt not uncover. The nakedness of thy son's daughter, or of thy daughter's daughter, *even* their nakedness thou shalt not uncover:
11 for their's *is* thine own nakedness. The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, she *is* thy sister, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness.
12 Thou shall not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister:[8] she *is* thy father's
13 near kinswoman.[4] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister:
14 for she *is* thy mother's near kinswoman.[4] Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father's brother,[9] thou shalt not approach to his wife: she *is* thine aunt.
15 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy daughter in law: she *is* thy son's
16 wife; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. Thou shalt not uncover the naked-
17 ness of thy brother's wife: it *is* thy brother's nakedness. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her daughter, neither shalt thou take her son's daughter, or her daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness; *for* they *are* her

Textual and Grammatical.

[1] Ver. 3. "מֵבִיא. *Introducturus sum.* Present for the future." Rosenmüller.

[2] Ver. 3. חֻקָּה. בְּחֻקֹּתֵיהֶם is variously and apparently arbitrarily rendered in the A. V. *ordinance* and *statute*, beside the occasional renderings, *custom, manner* and *rite.* There is no reason why the translation should not be uniform, and as *statute* is the more common, and hitherto in Lev. the uniform, rendering, this is adopted.

[3] Ver. 5. One MS. and the LXX. insert twice the word *all.* At the end of the verse the LXX. adds *your God.*

[4] Ver. 6. אֶל-כָּל-שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ, lit. *to any flesh of his flesh.* The distinction between בְּשָׂר and שְׁאֵר is not understood. The derivative of the latter, שַׁאֲרָה, is used in ver. 17 (where only it occurs) of blood relationship. The margin of the A. V. gives "Heb. remainder of his flesh" according to the pointing, שְׁאָר. In vers. 12, 13, שְׁאֵר is used alone of near blood relationship.

[5] Ver. 7. That the copulative וְ ought not to be rendered disjunctively as in the A. V. is evident from the latter part of the verse. LXX. has *καί*, Vulg. *et.*

[6] Ver. 9. מוֹלֶדֶת, according to the Masoretic punctuation, is Hiphil, and must therefore be taken as active, agreeing with *mother*, and mean "who hath borne children whether at home or abroad." The A. V., however, in common with all the ancient versions, has taken it as passive, מוּלֶדֶת, agreeing with daughter. For the rightfulness of this, Michaelis earnestly contends (Laws of Moses, Art. 114, 115). See Comment.

[7] Ver. 9. The Sam., 18 MSS. and the Syr. have the pronoun in the sing. The Vulg. omits it.

[8] Ver. 12. In the same construction in the following verse כִּי=*for* is supplied; it is found here also in 4 MSS. and in the versions generally.

[9] Ver. 14. The expletive conjunction וְ is here supplied in the Sam., in 25 MSS., and some ancient versions.

18 near kinswomen: it *is* wickedness. Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister,[10]
to vex *her*, to uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her life *time*.
19 Also thou shalt not approach unto a woman to uncover her nakedness, as long
20 as she is put apart for her uncleanness. Moreover thou shalt not lie carnally with
21 thy neighbour's wife, to defile thyself with her. And thou shalt not let any of thy
seed pass through *the fire* to Molech [thou shalt not dedicate any of thy seed to
22 Molech[11]], neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God: I *am* the LORD. Thou
23 shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it *is* abomination. Neither shalt
thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand
before a beast to lie down thereto: it *is* confusion.
24 Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all these the nations are
25 defiled which I cast out[13] before you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit
26 the iniquity thereof upon it, and the land itself vomiteth[13] out her inhabitants. Ye
shall therefore keep[12] my statutes and my judgments, and shall not commit *any* of
these abominations; *neither* any of your own nation, nor any stranger that sojourn-
27 eth among you: (for all these abominations have the men of the land done, which
28 *were* before you, and the land is defiled;) that the land spue not you out also, when
29 ye defile it, as it spued[13] out the nations that *were* before you. For whosoever shall
commit any of these abominations, even the souls that commit *them* shall be cut off
30 from among their people. Therefore shall ye keep mine ordinance, that *ye* commit
not *any one* of these abominable customs [statutes[2]], which were committed before
you, and that ye defile not yourselves therein: I *am* the LORD your God.

[10] Ver. 18. There can be here no question of the exact literalness of the rendering of the text of the A. V.; that of the margin is not a translation, but a more than doubtful *interpretation*. It would be an absolute prohibition of polygamy, which is here out of the question, unless stress were laid, as Poole has done, upon the purpose of such marriage, **to vex;** but the word לִצְרֹר *=to press, to bind together*, will not justify this.

[11] Ver. 21. For לְהַעֲבִיר, Sam. and LXX. read לְהַעֲבִיד *=to reduce to servitude*. A similar idea, *to dedicate*, may be given to the Heb. word as it stands. Vulg. *ut consecretur*, and similarly all the ancient versions. So the word is used, Ex. xiii. 12. As this is the first mention of Molech, and there is no word for fire, it is better to keep strictly to the original and translate *dedicate*. Rosenmuller, *traducas*. The corresponding expressions in xx. 2, 3, 4, have simply נָתַן *=to give*, without the following verb. According to the Masoretic punctuation Molech is always (except 1 Kings xi. 7) written with the article הַמֹּלֶךְ, and is rendered here and xx. 2, 3, 4, 5, by the LXX. ἄρχων, but Jer. xxxii. (Gr. xxxix.) 35, ὁ Μολὸχ βασιλεύς, 1 Kings xi. 7 (Gr. 5), simply ὁ βασιλεύς, and 2 Kings xxiii. 10, ὁ Μολόχ.

[12] Ver. 26. The Heb. has here the pronoun אַתֶּם in addition to the verbal suffix. It is omitted in the Sam. and in 3 MSS.

[13] Vers. 24, 25, 28. In ver. 24 מְשַׁלֵּחַ is the Hiphil Part.=*I am casting out*, and in accordance with this the preterites וַתִּקָּא (which has the ו conversive) of ver. 25 and כַּאֲשֶׁר קָאָה of ver. 28 are to be understood.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This chapter consists of an introductory exhortation, vers. 2–5; the laws against incest, vers. 6–18; the prohibition of other kind of unchastity and unnatural crimes, vers. 19–23; and a concluding exhortation, vers. 24-30. "The whole marriage law, as a holy limitation, marks two mutually opposite extremes or forms of excess: first, sins against the blood relationship, or against the fear of desecrating the common source of life, the community of blood, vers. 1–18; secondly, sins of the dissolute disposition, the horrible passing over the life-line of pure marriage, or the new relationship, into the various forms contrary to nature, vers. 19-30." Lange.

Vers. 2-5. This exhortation opens with reminding the people **I am the LORD your God**, and closes with the abbreviation of the same formula: **I am the LORD**. The same expression occurs again in the midst of it (ver. 4), and also at the opening of the law itself (ver. 6), in the midst of the third division of the chapter (ver. 21), and again at the close of the whole. It is designed to impress most strongly upon the minds of the Israelites that the observance of this law is a matter of covenant obligation. And this is enforced by the contrast (ver. 3) with **the doings of the land of Egypt** from which they had been delivered, and **the doings of the land of Canaan** whose nations were about to be cast out to make room for them. It closes with the promise that **if a man do** the Divine statutes and judgments, **he shall live in them.** Not merely, he shall not be cut off by the punishments denounced against the transgression of these laws in ch. xx.; but he shall gain that true life of communion with God which accompanies the obedience to His commands. Comp. Ezek. xx. 11, 13, 21; Luke x. 28. "This whole legislation bears on its front the name of Jehovah, the God of Israel, ver. 2, in the more definite signification that the Israelites should keep themselves holy in their personality, *i. e.* true to themselves, suitably to their personality, as Jehovah is holy (xix. 2). But the legislation took its occasion in this: that Israel, as the people hallowed by God, should form an instruc-

tive and rebuking contrast to the shameful sexual life of the land of Egypt, whence they had just come out, and that still more shameful of the land of Canaan, whither they were going under the leadership of Jehovah. . . . That this legislation was not able in later days to prevent transgressions, *e. g.* in the family of David itself, is explained even from the essential nature of law. From this a careful critic would decide for the high Mosaic age of the law rather than for the contrary.

"That a most highly living intelligence pervades the section results from the various significant expressions: the **judgments and statutes** of Jehovah (ver. 4) become for the people the **statutes and judgments** (first law, and only afterwards the idea (ver. 5)." [Patrick says: "The *Gemara Babylonica*, mentioning these words, saith, it is a tradition of their doctors that by מִשְׁפָּטִים are to be understood such natural laws as all mankind are bound to observe, though there were no written commands for them, such as those against idolatry, and those about uncovering the nakedness of such near relations as are here mentioned, and murder, *etc.* And by חֻקּוֹת such laws are meant as depended only on the pleasure of God, and obliged none but those to whom they were given, such as those about meats and garments and leprosy, *etc.*" F. G.] "That which is contrary to nature in the marriage of relations consists in this: that the man by his family life, which should be the foundation of new bonds of love and new families, mingles again egotisticallly with his own flesh (אֶל כָּל-שְׁאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ); and that by profane conduct he exposed the obscure and hallowed origin of his own life (uncovered the shame), and thus repeated the sin of Ham (for the shame of the wife of near kin is also the shame of the father, xx. 11). Therefore also it is necessary to explain the saying **which if a man do, he shall live in them** in its particular connection: all these directions tend to the furtherance of life, especially of the higher life, while the contrasted sexual relations produce death.

"The case of adultery is not considered, since the reference is to widows when connections with those who have been married before are considered. . . . . The determining principle is that of community of blood (שְׁאֵר). But this is itself determined by the fundamental idea that man and wife are one. Hence it follows that the shame of the father's wife is also the shame of the father himself (vers. 7, 8). The shame of a grand-daughter was looked upon, since she was a descendant, as the shame of the grandfather himself (ver. 10). The shame of the sister-in-law was thus also looked upon as the shame of the brother.

"As to the guilt and punishment, the death-penalty stands according to xx. 11 sqq. for the carnal intercourse (not merely the marrying) with a father's wife, with a daughter-in-law, with a half-sister" [and hence of course with a full sister]; "the punishment was, indeed, death by fire when one took a woman and her daughter together (that is זִמָּה)." [This necessarily includes the case of a daughter, and of a wife's mother. Michaelis (*Laws*, Art. 102) considers זִמָּה as a forensic term used to express those forms of incest in which the woman is under the guardianship of the man, and derives the word from the Arabic in which "*Zimm* means marriage, and *Zimma* the state of guardianship (*Clientela*), from the word *Zamm*, to connect." This sense is indeed appropriate for the very few places in which it occurs in the law (Lev. xviii. 17; xix. 29; xx. 14 *bis*), but elsewhere it is used for any abominable wickedness (as Job xxxi. 11) especially lewdness (Judg. xx. 6). See Gesen. *Thes.*—F. G.]. "It is said indefinitely of the intercourse with a sister of the father or of the mother, **they shall bear their iniquity** (עֲוֹנָן)." [xx. 19. Michaelis (Art. 112, 2) observes in regard to these and the following kinds of prohibited marriages, that Moses tolerated "their continuance, if once consummated. At least he nowhere enjoins a separation of the parties." It might be argued, indeed, that a forbidden marriage was utterly void, and therefore that its sin was constantly renewed as long as the parties continued to sustain towards each other the marriage relation; but certainly the penalty in the two following classes presupposes that they continued to live together.—F. G.]. "In contrast with this, it is said of him who slept with his father's brother's wife, **they shall bear their sin** (חֶטְאָם); **they shall die childless**" [xx. 20]. "So also of the case when any one takes his brother's wife, that is נִדָּה (Levitical uncleanness), **they shall be childless**" [xx. 21]. "Thus the social punishment is not wholly absent here also, but the principal thing was the threat of the Divine punishment of these connections with childlessness." [On the meaning of this punishment, see the preliminary note.—F. G.]. "Since in all these cases the willingness on the woman's side is assumed, the threat of the penalty is for both sides alike. It is worth while to notice also the circumstance that the penal statutes which refer to the marriage of relations are mingled with other penal statutes (xx. 13, 15, 16), a proof that here in chap. xx. another point of view is brought forward. But if in regard to the prohibition of the marriage with a brother's widow childlessness was threatened, while later the prohibition could be changed relatively into a command in the ordinance of the Levirate marriage" [the Levirate marriage took place only in case the brother died childless—F. G.]; "still there is made definitely prominent a principal end of the legislation in the manifold threat of childlessness, which evidently extended also over the greater transgressions or reached the Cherem: marriage was to be protected, observed, and kept holy as the nursery for the raising of children, for new families, and truly for pure and hallowed families (comp. Com. on Jno., p. 47" [Am. Ed., p. 111]).

"It is well known that in the treatment of these prohibited degrees of marriage various motives have been given, among others the following: the diminution and prevention of families in the marriage of relations. This motive comes out strongly here. Also in the expression in ver. 5, **he shall live by them.**" [A broader meaning may be given, as above, to ver. 5, and

the threat of childlessness has already been explained (prel. note) as referring to the legal reckoning of the children. If childlessness could be proved to be a natural penalty of the inter-marriage of near blood relations, it would yet wholly fail to apply to cases of simple affinity, to which alone the penalty is attached in the law. Very striking is its inapplicability to the marriage with a brother's wife, for if such a natural law existed, the Levirate marriage would have been wholly useless.—F. G.]. "But no less is there another motive here implied: the respect of kinship, (*respectus parentelæ*), and even the forcible expression **uncover the nakedness** only brings out strongly the impiety which, in such cases, uncovers the fountains of its own life, which have been hitherto concealed by natural respect." [See this point discussed at length in Michaelis (Art. 107) who decides that it had no influence in the Mosaic legislation.—F. G.]. "And it is plain, that with this unnatural going back of men to the roots of their own existence in this perversion of marriage, which is the specific school of the future, into a retrogressive movement, it must immediately follow that family egoism will be at the same time ever more and more cherished; whereas the Theocracy, as the religion of the future, seeks to establish marriage on the basis of ever new conditions of love, for the purpose of building up a most intimate fellowship in the human family."* [See this motive also discussed and rejected by Michaelis, Art. 106.—F. G.].

"It is well known that the hierarchy and its theology has not only not explained ideally the law of the marriages of relations, has not only brought it over unchanged into the new covenant; but has also stiffened it still more by another calculation of the degrees of relationship, by the addition of spiritual relationships, and by the prohibition to marry the sister of a deceased sister† [wife]. In regard to heathen marriage customs, see Knobel, p. 502 sqq.

"That these marriage laws of Leviticus form a great and sharp contrast to the immoral customs of the Egyptians and the Canaanites expresses the very cause of this legislation. More in regard to the immorality of the heathen may be found in Knobel, p. 502 sqq., in Keil, p. 127 sqq." [Trans. p. 413 note, p. 418], "and especially in the *Historisch-politischen Briefen* of I. v. Raumer, p. 29 sqq. It is particularly worthy of notice that the Arabian morals have the greatest resemblance to these morals of the law, which may perhaps be explained from their Semitic character." [But the legislation of the Japhetic Greeks and Romans, and of the Hindoos for the higher castes was even more strict, as noted by Lange below; and the doom pronounced upon the Canaanites certainly implies that their sins were such as might be recognized in any nation by the light of nature.—F. G.]. "The lascivious service of lust of the Egyptians, illustrated by Ptolemy's marriage with his sister, and by the history of Cleopatra, would appear the more remarkable since the Egyptian customs and religion on all sides admonished of death; but perhaps, indeed, this fact depends upon a connection between sexual pleasure and the thought of death, as *e. g.*, in war and camp life, such a connection is to be observed. Besides the Arabian customs, the harsher character of the Hindoo and of the Roman legislation is to be particularly noticed." Lange.

Vers. 6–18. The phrase **uncover the nakedness** continued to be used to express sexual intercourse through many ages. Comp. Ezek. xvi. 36; xxiii. 18. The list of prohibited degrees begins appropriately with the mother. Her nakedness is described as **the nakedness of thy father**, since husband and wife constitute "one flesh," Gen. ii. 24. "Strictly speaking גִּלַּה עֶרְוָה is used only with reference to the wife; but in the dishonoring of his wife the honor of the husband is violated also, and his bed defiled, Gen. xlix. 4." Keil. Comp. ver. 8. Rosenmüller explains the phrase as meaning the nakedness which is (or was) under the control of the father. The Targ. of Jonathan assumes an ellipsis, and renders "a woman shall not cohabit with her father, nor a man with his mother," which is neither agreeable to the Hebrew, nor consistent with the fact that the whole law is addressed to the man. Aben Ezra, as quoted by Rosenmüller, well expresses the arrangement: "He begins with the father, who precedes the son, and declares forbidden all nakedness of the father and mother; the mother is placed first, then the nakedness of the wife of the father who is not the mother, then the sister who is the daughter of the father or of the mother." In ver. 8 **thy father's wife** refers to another wife than the mother of the person addressed, and the term **wife** is of course broad enough to include the concubine. The sinfulness of this act, as in the case of Reuben (Gen. xxxv. 22; xlix. 3, 4) was understood long before the giving of the Mosaic law, and continued to be held in abomination among the Gentiles in Apostolic days (1 Cor. v. 1); nevertheless it was one of the crimes of which Absalom was deliberately guilty (2 Sam. xvi. 22), and as already noticed, it was regularly practised by the monarchs of Persia.—**Thy father's nakedness** is used in the same sense as in ver. 7. Connection with a half-sister on either side being forbidden in ver. 9, that with a full sister, since she might be described as a half-sister on both sides, is doubly forbidden. The expression **born at home or born abroad** has been variously interpreted. The true sense is undoubtedly that given by Rosenmüller, "a sister in whatever way she may be a sister, whether of the same or of different parents, whether legitimately or illegitimately born." Thus are included the daughter of either father or mother by either a previous or a subsequent marriage (and these cases would have been much more frequent under laws allowing of divorce and remarriage), or the daughter of the father by another wife; also illegitimate children of either. The marriage of Abraham and Sarah is often referred to as an instance in opposition to this

* Comp. Winer, Art. *Ehe.* Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie, Ehe bei den Hebräern u. a. Lexica.* H. Spöudlin, *Ueber das Eheverbot wegen verwandtschaft und das verbrechen des Incestes,* Zurich, 1844. The same, p. 13: "*die richtige Begrundung von Augustin.*"

† "Here comes into notice the illiberal article in the English law, which has already produced many tragic occurrences."

law; but it is more probable that the word *sister* is there used in the broader sense, and that Sarah was really the niece of Abraham. Ver. 10. **Theirs' is thine own nakedness.**—Because of their direct descent, intercourse with them would involve a sort of incest with one's self. Of course this would apply *à fortiori* to the case of a daughter which is not specifically mentioned, but is included in the prohibition of ver. 17. The prohibition of ver. 11 of the half-sister on the father's side seems already included in the broader one of ver. 9. Various explanations have been given to mark a difference between them, among which perhaps the best is that of Keil: that ver. 9 treats of the connection of a son by a second marriage with a daughter by a first marriage, while ver. 11 applies to the connection of a son by a first marriage with a daughter by a subsequent marriage; but this seems an undue limitation of ver. 9. Probably there was at the time some technical use of the terms which constituted a distinction which is now lost. According to Selden (*Uxor Hebr.* L. I. c. 4) ver. 11 admits of the translation "The nakedness of thy father's wife's daughter (but she who is begotten of thy father is thy sister) thou shalt not uncover;" thereby meaning to forbid connection with the daughter of a step-mother, and marking this as a distinct prohibition from that of the half-sister. Intercourse with an aunt on either the father's or the mother's side is forbidden in vers. 12, 13, on the principle of near blood relationship; but there is no prohibition of marriage with the corresponding relation of niece. The reason of this distinction is not apparent. According to Ex. vi. 20, Moses was himself the offspring of the marriage of Amram with Jochebed, his paternal aunt. This would indicate that this prohibited degree is a matter of the Divine statute rather than of natural law, and was not therefore necessarily extended to the niece. In ver. 14 the prohibition is extended to the wife of the paternal uncle, as having become an aunt by her union with the uncle. It would not however follow from this that the law forbade the marriage of a woman with the husband of her aunt, since in consequence of the dependence of the family upon the male in the Hebrew polity, the corresponding relations upon the mother's side stood in a less intimate relation than those upon the father's. In the reverse order, however, the prohibition is more stringent upon the woman than upon the man, since a woman is hereby forbidden to marry her husband's nephew, while the man is not forbidden to marry his wife's niece. The application of this principle to ver. 15 would seem at first sight to lead to the permission of the abominable marriage of a woman with her son-in-law; but this is guarded against by ver. 17. The prohibition of intercourse with a brother's wife in connection with the more ancient custom of the levirate marriage has already been explained in the preliminary note. It is particularly to be observed that the levirate marriage only took place in case the brother had died childless, and she was still his wife at his death, and that even then it was not so much a fresh marriage, as a sort of continuance of the marriage of the deceased by his nearest surviving representative. The prohibitions of ver. 17 have already been seen to complement several of the other prohibitions, and the principle which forbids the connection with both a mother and a daughter is extended also to the grand-daughter. On ver. 18 see preliminary note.

"Keeping the seed sacred to its purpose, is as has been said the fundamental thought of our section. Hence over against the physico-spiritual sins against nature of marriage of blood relations is placed, as the other extreme, the violation of nature in desecrating the blood with beasts or demons. The first sin is, indeed, a violation of nature which can take place in marriage itself, the transgressing the unapproachableness of a woman in her sickness. But a sickness in sexual relation is certainly the condition of menstruation, ver. 19." [After the list of prohibited degrees, whether of consanguinity or of affinity, naturally follows the prohibition of other unlawful conditions of sexual intercourse. First is mentioned that of which there was the greatest danger of violation. The feminine **uncleanness** here named is the נִדָּה, including both the monthly uncleanness (xv. 33) and the uncleanness after childbirth (xii. 2). The violation of this is enumerated by Ezek. (xviii. 6; xxii. 10) among sins of a most serious character. Next comes adultery (ver. 20), then the giving of the seed to Molech (ver. 21), and finally sodomy (ver. 22), and bestial sins (ver. 23).—F. G.]. "The second sin is adultery: it defiles a man in three and four ways, since he commits treason against the teleology of his seed, against his personal dignity, against the sacrifice of his pleasure, and against his betrayed neighbor. On the punishment of adultery see Knobel, p. 506." [Both parties were to be put to death, xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22; Comp. Jno. viii. 5. Knobel further notes that other nations of antiquity were less rigorous; they generally punished the adulterer with a fine (Diod. 12, 21), but also more severely. Among the Egyptians the adulterer must submit to a thousand blows and have his nose cut off (Diod. 1, 78); among the Indians both pecuniary and bodily punishment, as well as exile and death were commanded (Manu 8, 352 ss.); among the Greeks, the woman suffered repudiation and infamy, while the adulterer could be put to death or receive from the court a severe bodily punishment (Wachsmuth II. 1, p. 272). Knobel further mentions the punishments among the Moslems and the modern Orientals.—F. G.]. "The third sin is the sacrifice to Molech, here manifestly infanticide and falling away from the name of Jehovah at once. Knobel: "By this is meant not a mere lustration by means of fire, but an actual burning. See Movers, *Phonizier* I., p. 328 sqq. On the Molech sacrifice, see the same, p. 506. Opposed to this, the deductions of Keil, that the expression here indicates only a lustration or a *februation* (P. 130, 131 [Trans. p. 416, 417]) can hardly be maintained." [The precise purport of this prohibition is very uncertain. In Deut. xii. 31, it is mentioned as a sin of the Canaanites that "even their sons and their daughters they have burnt in the fire to their gods," and the Israelites are warned against imitating them. It is generally assumed by commentators that the deity there intended is Molech, and that by **seed**

in our passage is meant children, and that thus both refer to the same thing. But here we have no mention of fire (see Textual Note 9), and it is at least doubtful if **seed** here means offspring. Although explanations are offered by the commentators of such an abrupt change of subject, yet it is far more in accordance with the context and the general purpose of the chapter to understand **seed** here simply of the *semen*. Too little is now known of the worship of Molech at this very ancient date to determine precisely the meaning of the expression. It is noticeable, however, that there is no other prohibition of the foul habit of masturbation, for which there seems to be need; may it not be conjectured that this act was known as "giving one's seed to Molech," and was associated with the practices of idolatry? The sin, whatever it was, connected itself with the worship of a false god as is shown by the clause **neither shalt thou profane the name of thy God.** It was not only itself to be punished with death by stoning; but punishment was also denounced against any one who saw the sin committed and did not expose it (xx. 2–6). If the above conjecture is right, it was very natural that in after times this custom should have advanced, as it did, to the actual burning of children as a sacrifice to Molech (2 Ki. xxiii. 10; Ezek. xvi. 20, 21, *etc.*), though even this is explained by many of merely passing the children between two fires.—F. G.]. "The fourth sin is the especially abominable sin of Sodom, *Pœderastia*, for which the Canaanites at last received the sentence, that their land should "spue them out;" nature herself could no more endure them. See 1 Kings, Commentary p. 56" [Trans. p. 75?] "The fifth sin is the acme of abominableness, conjunction with a beast, and yet this was something that occurred, or else the law would not have spoken of it. According to Herodotus and Pindar, women at Mendes let themselves be mounted by a he-goat (Herod. 2, 46, *etc.*)." Knobel. See similar examples given by the same." [The fearful prevalence of Sodomy, (which takes its name from a Canaanitish city), in the Rome of Apostolic days is evident from Rom. i. 24, 27, as well as from the classic authors. The practice of it seems to have been inveterate among the Hebrews, 1 Kings xiv. 24. "Ver. 22. The ancient Persian law sternly condemned this offence (*Vendid.* viii. 10 *ap.* Knobel). Also the Hindoo law (*Menu* xi. 174, 175), and the Koran, vii. 78-80. Ver. 23. The story of Pasiphæ may furnish proof that the early Greeks abhorred this offence. The Hindoo law punishes it severely *Menu* xi. 17, *Gentoo laws*, p. 280. The Moslem law condemns it, *Hedàya* II., p. 27." Clark.—F. G.]. "The following inculcation of these prohibitions, vers. 24-30, contains the most expressive apology for the conquest of Canaan on the part of the Israelites; and that this was no partiality of Jehovah, is plain from the fact that He threatens the Israelites with entirely the same punishment in case they should sin in the same way, and moreover, that He enacts the death penalty for the single offender." Lange.

The poetic representation of the land as vomiting out its inhabitants is founded upon a truth which required that the laws of this chapter should be made binding upon the **stranger that sojourneth among you** as well as upon the Israelites themselves (ver. 26). The land which the ancestors of Israel were not allowed to possess, "because the iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full" (Gen. xv. 16), had now become filled with a mass of festering moral corruption. Its inhabitants were to be cast out and the holy people planted in their stead. It could not be allowed that "the stranger" should again introduce the pollutions which were now being so severely punished.

The only punishment here threatened for the violation of these precepts is first the national one, in case the sins became national, of being treated as their predecessors had been; and secondly, the individual punishment for individual offenders (ver. 29), they **shall be cut off from among their people.** They were to be excommunicated as violators of the holiness required of the covenant people. Israel, however, constituted a state as well as a church, and later, in ch. xx., the civil punishment of these crimes is fully prescribed. Here the legislator speaks of the sin rather than of the crime, and consequently of the spiritual rather than the civil penalty.

The preterites of ver. 25 וַתִּקָּא (A. V. **vomiteth out**) and ver. 28 קָאָה (A. V. **spued out**) must necessarily be determined in their sense by the whole context, and especially by the מְשַׁלֵּחַ = *I am casting out*, of ver. 24. The whole transaction is represented as one in progress, as in xx. 23 (where the same participle is used), and from any fair consideration of these chapters in themselves it would be impossible to infer that the casting out of the Canaanites was already an accomplished fact. It is therefore quite unnecessary to speak of these preterites (Keil), as prophetic.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. We have here set forth (ver. 5) the principle which St. Paul declares (Rom. x. 5; Gal. iii. 12) to be the fundamental principle of the whole law,—that salvation depends upon obedience. On this ground he shows that man can never attain justification, since it is impossible for him to offer a perfect obedience. The law by a practical demonstration of this fact becomes "our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." Nevertheless, "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good" (Rom. vii. 12), and the faith which leads to salvation is dead without the earnest effort at obedience. Hence God sets forth His laws as that **which if a man do he shall live in them**, and it has ever proved that the path of obedience is the path of life in every sense.

II. "The family relationship is itself ordained by God. It is the birthplace of the children of God—the first school, and generally the source of all chastity and good manners. Any injury inflicted on it would undermine the temporal and eternal welfare both of individuals and of the people. In this lies the abomination of incest. This is the reason of that natural horror of it which God has implanted in us. This is the reason that, among all nations, marriage within cer-

tain degrees was forbidden, although the laws of the most moral nations wavered in respect to the exact boundaries. . . . Because this was the reason of the prohibited degrees, we see also why, in the family of the first men, when there was no difference between family and people, brothers and sisters might marry without sin." O. von Gerlach.

III. The Canaanites were to be punished for their offences against the marriage law. But they would not have been guilty if they had had no knowledge that what they did was wrong, (Rom. iv. 15; v. 13). It is therefore evident that there must be a natural law or a tradition of primeval revelation which should have enabled them to recognize the sinfulness of their customs.

IV. Although the Mosaic legislation recognizes polygamy and divorce on trivial grounds, yet still it cannot be arrayed as in opposition to the higher law of Christian purity. On the contrary, like the laws of revenge and many others, these laws were restrictions leading the people as they were able to bear it towards the higher law of the Gospel. That they fell short of this was simply because God suffered it to be so temporarily "because of the hardness of men's hearts."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"The chapter about the forbidden degrees of marriage has in its immediate form a much greater meaning for dogmatics, morals, and the legal and ecclesiastical ordinance of marriage, than it has for homiletics. The New Testament explanation and application of this law is so great a subject and work, that here we must refer to the literature relating thereto. But indirectly, these laws are a treasury also for homiletics. By the prohibition of the marriage of relations, God ever forms new sets of relationships. By this He brings to view the universal relationship which lies upon the foundation of human manifoldness and diversity. He manifests harmony in the contrasts of genealogies. He freshens anew the duty of love in a thousand ways; and freshens, too, marriage in a thousand ways through love. Sexual love, in its dignity, is here hallowed through the law. Strangers and aliens become, by this divine ordinance, relatives, brothers and friends; a holy web of love, in spite of single desecrations, spreads from town to town, from land to land, from people to people. The *egoism* of family, rank, and class, is a kind of heathenism which this law combats with a prefigurative force, and Christianity meets by its consecration of the state of betrothal on the foundation of Christian brotherly love and universal philanthropy. The expression of these prohibitions of marriage designates the transgressions without any anxious fear except to oppose with strong words the lack of fear in life, and to create a holy fear before the sources of life, the mysterious darkness of the continuous creation of man. When the ideality of the legal life fails, there is made prominent the marked unhallowed nakedness and rudeness of the sexual relations. The various forms and degrees of guilt are to be noticed. Over against the offences against the family life in too near relationship, come the horrors of the sexual crimes against nature (ver. 21 sqq. Comp. Rom. i.). The flagrant violation of nature is emphasized by the threat that the violated nature, the horrified land, would itself undertake the punishment, and spue out such sinners. But the positive punishments also were not to be omitted (chap. xx.). And it must not be overlooked that Jehovah introduces and closes these commands with the explanation of His name Jehovah, His holy personality. The establishment of personal dignity in a kingdom of true personal continuance in love, is the purpose of the law." Lange.

Besides its moral and social bearings, the Levitical law has another and most important aspect. It has been found historically that all great deviations from the faith bear fruit, sooner or later, in sensual sins; and conversely, all relaxation of the law of sexual purity has sustained itself by the denial or perversion of fundamental doctrine. The Levitical law was therefore a safeguard of the truth, and herein men received an essential part of their training, not merely for the high morality, but also for the high religious truth of the Gospel. We see at Corinth how danger to the one went hand in hand with danger to the other.

THIRD SECTION.

Holiness of Conduct towards God and Man.

CHAP. XIX. 1–16.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto all the congregation[1] of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God *am* holy.

3 Ye shall fear every man his mother,[2] and his father, and keep my sabbaths: I *am* the LORD your God.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. עֲדַת = congregation is omitted by 3 MSS. and the LXX.

[2] Ver. 3. In the LXX., Vulg., and Syr., the order is reversed to *his father and his mother*. The Sam and Onk. follow the Hebrew.

4 Turn ye not unto idols,[3] nor make to yourselves molten gods: I *am* the LORD
your God.
5 And if ye offer a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD, ye shall offer it at
6 your own will [offerings, unto the LORD ye shall offer it for your acceptance[4]]. It
shall be eaten the same day ye offer it, and on the morrow: and if ought remain
7 until the third day, it shall be burnt in the fire. And if it be eaten at all on the
8 third day, it *is* abominable; it shall not be accepted. Therefore *every one* that
eateth[5] it shall bear his iniquity, because he hath profaned the hallowed thing of
the LORD: and that soul shall be cut off from among his people.
9 And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not wholly reap the cor-
10 ners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleanings of thy harvest. And thou
shalt not glean thy vineyard [fruit garden[6]], neither shalt thou gather *every* grape
[the scattered fruit[7]] of thy vineyard [fruit garden[6]]; thou shalt leave them for
the poor and stranger: I *am* the LORD your God.
11, 12 Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another. And ye
shall not swear by my name falsely, neither shalt thou profane the name of thy
13 God: I *am* the LORD. Thou shalt not defraud [oppress[8]] thy neighbour, neither[9]
rob *him:* the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until
the morning.
14 Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling-block before the blind, but
shalt fear thy God: I *am* the LORD.
15 Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment:[10] thou shalt not respect the person
of the poor, nor honour the person of the mighty: *but* in righteousness shalt thou
judge thy neighbour.
16 Thou shalt not go up and down *as* a talebearer among thy people:[11] neither[12]
17 shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbour: I *am* the LORD. Thou shalt
not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour,
18 and not suffer sin upon him [and not bear sin on his account[13]]. Thou shalt not
avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love
thy neighbour as thyself: I *am* the LORD.
19 Ye shall keep my statutes. Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse
kind:[14] thou shalt not sow thy field with mingled [diverse[15]] seed: neither shall a
garment mingled [a diverse garment[15]] of linen and woollen[16] come upon thee.

[3] Ver. 4. אֱלִילִים = *inania numina*, Rosen. It is formed from אֵל with a termination expressive of contempt.

[4] Ver. 5. לִרְצֹנְכֶם = *for your acceptance.* See Textual Note [6] on i. 3.

[5] Ver. 8. The Heb. has the plural form אֹכְלָיו, but the Sam. and other versions have the sing. as in the following verb and noun.

[6] Ver. 10. כֶּרֶם is generally a vineyard, but also (Judg. xv. 7) an olive yard. It is "a field or yard of the nobler plants and trees, cultivated in the manner of a garden or orchard," Gesen. It is doubtless here used in its broadest sense, and the *vineyard* of the A. V. is therefore too restricted.

[7] Ver. 10. פֶּרֶט = *that which is scattered*, and hence meaning here both the fallen fruit (Chald., Vulg., Syr.), and also the single berries of the olive and the vine not gathered with the harvest.

[8] Ver. 13. תַּעֲשֹׁק. Ver. 11 forbids sins of craft and falsehood against one's neighbor; this, sins of violence and open oppression. The translation given is that of the A. V. in Deut. xxiv. 14.

[9] Ver. 13. The Heb. לֹא is without the conjunction which is supplied in 40 MSS. in the Sam. and the LXX.

[10] Ver. 15. The conjunction וְ is prefixed in 7 MSS., the Sam., LXX., and Syr.

[11] Ver. 16. בְּעַמֶּיךָ. The Sam. and 66 MSS. omit the ׳.

[12] Ver. 16. Here again the Heb. omits the conjunction which is supplied in 40 MSS., and in the Syr.

[13] Ver. 17. וְלֹא-תִשָּׂא עָלָיו חֵטְא is a clause the meaning of which has been much questioned. It seems certain, however, that נָשָׂא cannot mean *suffer*, (permit) as in the A. V., but must mean *bear* as in the margin. The marginal *for him* is ambiguous, and it is better therefore to use the more explicit *on his account.* For instances of precisely the same sense of these words, see xxii. 9; Num. xviii. 32, and comp. also the very similar expression in Ps. lxix. 8.

[14] Ver. 19. 3 MSS., the Sam., LXX., and Syr., prefix the conjunction.

[15] Ver. 19. כִּלְאַיִם (dual from כִּלְאָא = *separation*) occurs only in this verse (three times) and in the parallel Deut. xxii. 9, but is frequent in the Talmud. It signifies *of two kinds, heterogeneous.* The translation of the A. V. at its first occurrence in the ver. *diverse* is good, and should by all means be retained in the other clauses, both for consistency's sake, and for the force of the command. All the Semitic versions preserve the uniformity.

[16] Ver. 19. שַׁעַטְנֵז occurs only here and in Deut. xxii. 11, where it is explained "of woolen and linen together." Its etymology is obscure. See the Lexicons and Bochart, *Hieroz.* I., lib. II., c. 35, p. 545, ed. Rosen. It is probably an Egyptian word, although not yet satisfactorily explained. The Chald. retains the word, and the LXX. translates κίβδηλον = *spurious, adulterated*, probably by a mere conjecture. Rosenmüller quotes Forster as explaining it of a costly Egyptian dress woven in various figures of plants and animals in colors, having a symbolical idolatrous signification. See Com.

20 And whosoever lieth carnally with a woman that *is* a bondmaid, betrothed[17] to
an husband, and not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her; she shall be scourged
[there shall be punishment[18]], they shall not be put to death, because she was not
21 free. And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the LORD, unto the door of the
22 tabernacle of the congregation, *even* a ram for a trespass offering. And the priest
shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass offering before the
LORD for his sin which he hath done: and the sin which he hath done shall be
forgiven him.
23 And when ye shall come into the land, and shall have planted all manner of
trees for food, then ye shall count the fruit thereof as uncircumcised:[19] three years
24 shall it be as uncircumcised to you: it shall not be eaten of. But in the fourth
25 year all the fruit thereof shall be holy to praise[20] the LORD *withal*. And in the fifth
year shall ye eat of the fruit thereof, that it may yield[21] unto you the increase
thereof: I *am* the LORD your God.
26 Ye shall not eat *any thing* with the blood:[22] neither[23] shall ye use enchantment,
27 nor observe times. [23]Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt
28 thou [24] mar the corners of thy[24] beard. Ye shall not make any cuttings in your
flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you: I *am* the LORD.
29 Do not prostitute thy daughter, to cause her to be a whore; lest the land fall to
whoredom, and the land become full of wickedness.
30 Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my sanctuary: I *am* the LORD.
31 Regard not them that have familiar spirits, neither seek after wizards to be de-
filed by them: I *am* the LORD your God.
32 Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour the face of the old man,
and fear thy God: I *am* the LORD.
33 And if a stranger sojourn with thee[25] in your land, ye shall not vex [oppress[26]] him.
34 *But* [*omit but*[27]] the stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born
among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land
of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God.
35 Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in meteyard, in weight, or in mea-

[17] Ver. 20. נֶחְרָפֶת Niph. from חָרַף = *to tear off, to set apart.* There seems no doubt of the correctness of the text of the A. V., and the margin is therefore unnecessary.

[18] Ver. 20. בִּקֹּרֶת תִּהְיֶה. This word is ἅπ. λεγ., but there seems little doubt of its meaning, *investigation*, and then *punishment.* Authorities are much divided on the question whether both parties, or only the woman, was to be scourged. The LXX., Vulg., and Syr., are clear for the former, while the Sam. applies it only to the man. In the uncertainty it is better to retain the indefiniteness of the Heb. as in the marg. of the A. V. The Sam. reading is remarkable בקרת תהיה לו = *he shall be punished*, and then, in the sing. לא יומת = he shall not die. This gives a sense agreeing excellently with the reason assigned **because she was not free,** and hence the act did not legally constitute adultery which was punishable with death.

[19] Ver. 23. "The singular suffix in עָרְלָתוֹ" [and also in פִּרְיוֹ] "refers to כֹּל, and the verb ערל is a *denom.* from עָרְלָה, to make into a foreskin, to treat as uncircumcised, *i. e.*, to throw away as unclean or uneatable." Keil. The LXX. rendering περικαθαριεῖτε τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτοῦ = *ye shall purge away its uncleanness* expresses very well the general sense.

[20] Ver. 24. הִלּוּלִים occurs only here and in Judg. ix. 27. In the latter place it seems to mean merry-making feasts to idols, and Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8, 19) understands the law to be that the fruit of the fourth year should be carried to the place of the Sanctuary, and there used in a holy feast with friends and the poor. But the following verse seems so clearly to forbid the owner's partaking of it before the fifth year that it would be unsafe to change the translation. The marg. of the A. V. *holiness of praises to the Lord* does not convey any distinct idea. The idea of Murphy *a praise offering* is hardly sustained by the text. The true sense is probably that incorporated into the Targ. Onk. *it shall be consecrated to those offering praises before the Lord, i. e.*, it was to be given to the Lord through His priests, and used by them in feasts.

[21] Ver. 25. For לְהוֹסִיף **that it may yield,** the Sam., followed by the Vulg., reads לְהַאֲסִיף *for collecting* (in storehouses) the produce.

[22] Ver. 26. עַל־הַדָּם. The LXX. must have read ר instead of ד to sustain the version ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, and some critics would adopt this to avoid the peculiarity of the construction of עַל, considering it justified by the frequency of the practice in connection with idolatrous feasts (comp. Hos. iv. 13). But a mis-reading of the LXX. is not a sufficient ground for a change of the text; for the construction of עַל see Ex. xii. 8, and comp. Textual Note [4] on ii. 2.

[23] Vers. 26, 27. In both places the Sam., one or two MSS., and the LXX., supply the conjunction.

[24] Ver. 27. The Sam. and most of the Ancient Versions put the verb and the pronoun in the plural in accordance with the previous clause.

[25] Ver. 33. The Sam. and versions have the plural.

[26] Ver. 33. The marg. of the A. V. expresses the sense of תּוֹנֶנּוּ better than the text.

[27] Ver. 34. There is no occasion for the insertion of the *but* of the A. V.

36 sure. Just balances, just weights,[28] a just ephah, and a just hin, shall ye have: I
37 *am* the LORD your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt. Therefore shall ye observe all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: I *am* the LORD.

[28] Ver. 36. The marg. of the A. V. *stones* is unnecessary, that being merely the primary sense of אֶבֶן, while *weight* is the fully established derivative sense.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

With this chapter begins a new *Parashah* of the law extending to xx. 27. The parallel *Haphtarah* from the prophets is Ezek. xx. 2-20, recounting the disobedience of Israel in the wilderness to the commands of this chapter and their consequent punishment; and the close of Amos ix. 7-15, denouncing the punishment and foretelling the final restoration of God's people —a prophecy applied by S. James (Acts xv. 16, 17) to the gathering in of the Gentiles to the Church of Christ.

"This remarkable chapter is perhaps the most comprehensive, the most varied, and in some respects the most important section of Leviticus, if not of the Pentateuch; it was by the ancient Jews regarded as an epitome of the whole Law; it was adopted and paraphrased by the best gnomic writers, such as Pseudo-Phocylides; and it has at all times been looked upon as a counterpart of the Decalogue itself." Kalisch.

It treats of the holiness in the daily life and conversation which must characterize the covenant people of a holy God. This basis of the commands given is prominently brought forward at the opening and continually kept in mind by the phrase **I am the Lord** throughout. This expresses at once the basis of the command, and the goal towards which the Israelite must strive. It is as difficult to arrange these laws systematically as to do so with the duties of the daily life, and an arrangement which would be systematic from one point of view would not be so from another. The following analysis of the chapter, from Murphy, presents a somewhat different view from that given by Lange below: "They are in communion with God (1-8), in the communion of saints (9-22), and are about to be in a land of holiness (23-32), and visited by strangers (33-37). And each of these relations brings out a series of duties peculiar to itself."

Lange says: "We hold that this section, as being the summing up of the laws of the theocratic humanity, is quite in place, as a contrast to the characteristics of the heathen inhumanity which the foregoing chapter has displayed; and in so far forth comprises in no part anything repeated, varying, or in the more restricted sense religious. It gives the characteristics of the consecrated human personality in the theocracy, and of its conduct as it should correspond with the holy personality of Jehovah, and hence it is said again and again: **I am Jehovah.** From this constant refrain a liturgy of religious humanity could be unfolded. First, in threefold distinctness: **Ye shall be holy,** *i. e.* hallowed personalities, **for I Jehovah your God am holy,** and ever again **I am Jehovah your God** (vers. 3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36), or **I am Jehovah** (vers. 12, 14, 16, 18, 28, 30, 32, 37). Evidently these statements together, as the characteristics of the private human conduct, stand in connection with the legislation for the social humanity in the section, Ex. xxi.-xxiii.

"Disposition: vers. 1, 2. The principle of humanity: Jehovah the Holy One. Vers. 3-8. True and false piety. Vers. 9-18. Inwardly grounded humanity. Vers. 19-32. Observance of the moral laws of nature. Vers. 33-37. Observance of hospitality and the duties of trade.

"The first theocratic law of humanity is the root of all that follow, the law of piety. And here it is not said: 'Father and mother,' but **mother and father;** for the mother precedes the father in the duty of mankind." Wordsworth says in reference to this order: "In the former chapter God had displayed the evils consequent on the abuse of woman, and here He inculcates reverence towards her, as the foundation of social happiness." This is the fifth commandment of the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 12), and is clearly necessary to be called to mind here; for as the family is the basis of all social organization, so is reverence to parents the first necessity of family order. Next follows the reiteration of the fourth commandment (Ez. xx. 12) as the first duty of man beyond the immediate respect due from him to those from whom he derives his being. The great prominence everywhere given in Scripture to the observance of the Sabbath (comp. *e. g.* Ez. xx. 12, 13, 16, 20, 21, 24, being the portion from the prophets read in the synagogue in connection with this chapter), and the universality of its obligation as grounded upon the Divine rest, show how deeply this must enter into all excellent social organization. These two precepts are here coupled together as they are in the Decalogue, and they are the only commands given there in positive form. They "express two great central points, the first belonging to natural law, and the second to positive law, in the maintenance of the well-being of the social body of which Jehovah was the acknowledged king." Clark. It is noticeable that the same generality which is given to the command in Ex. by the use of the sing. is here attained also by the use of the plural; for the plural is not to be understood as used (Kalisch) for the purpose of including other festivals than the weekly day of rest.

Ver. 4. This precept includes the two first commands of the Decalogue. The order of commands in this chapter, in so far as the commands themselves are the same, is different from that in the Decalogue, because there the starting point is from God Himself; here from man in his family and social relations. In regard to this precept, Lange says: "If the heart of man becomes benumbed to the use of images of false gods of any kind, he sinks down to the idols which are his ideals, and becomes as dumb and

unspiritual as they are, ver. 4. All gods of the heathen are *Elilim*, nothingnesses, Ps. xcvi. 5; cxv. 8; cxxxv. 18; Isa. xl. 18; xliv. 10, *etc.*" Comp. also Deut. xxvii. 15. It was a notion of the Rabbins that this word was compounded of לֹא=*not*, and אֵל=*God*. Comp. 1 Cor. viii. 4; x. 19.

Vers. 5–8. The Legislator now turns to the especial outward act of communion with God in the peace offering. His object is not to speak of sacrifices in general, nor even of any special kind of peace offering; therefore the distinctions of vii. 11–21 are not referred to. The reference is rather to xvii. 3-7, according to which, during the wilderness life, all food of sacrificial animals was to be sanctified by the peace offering. So here all holy feasting of communion with God must be based upon a sacrifice for their **acceptance**, and must be treated according to the commands already given. The order of the precepts is therefore perfectly natural: first, filial duty; then the observance of the fundamental divine institution for society; next, negatively, the entire turning away from everything that could come into rivalry with God; and now the keeping holy of the appointed means of communion with Him. After this come (9-18) various precepts to guard the holiness of conduct toward one's neighbor, especially the poor and distressed, illustrated by one command of detail after another until the all including principle is announced, **thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.**

Vers. 9, 10. The gatherer of his harvest, out of the abundance which God had given him, must have a generous care for the poor and the stranger; the poor, as those unable to cultivate their own land, or who had been obliged to sell it until the next year of Jubilee; and the stranger, as those who by the organization of the Hebrew commonwealth could have no possession of land in their country. The LXX. and the Syr. interpret **stranger** of proselytes, and are followed by some Jewish commentators; but such restriction is plainly at variance with the whole spirit of the command. The same precept is repeated, in regard to the grain harvest, in connection with the feast of weeks (xxiii. 22), and more generally in Deut. xxiv. 19-22 with a reminder of the privations and bondage they had themselves endured in Egypt. The story of Ruth is a beautiful exemplification of the operation of this statute.

Ver. 11. This and the following precepts take the usual negative form of statutory law. The eighth commandment is here joined with the offences recounted in vi. 2-5 of falsehood and fraud towards others. St. Augustine here (Qu. 68) enters at length into the casuistical question of the justifiableness of lying under certain peculiar circumstances, citing the example of Rahab among others. He concludes that it was not her lying, as such, which received the divine approbation, but her desire to serve God, which indeed prompted her lie. However this may be, it is plain that the law here has in view not extraordinary and exceptional cases, but the ordinary dealings of man with man. Such law is of universal obligation. Comp. Col. iii. 9.

Ver. 12 is of course covered by the third commandment, but is not coextensive with it, since the point of view here is that of conduct towards one's neighbor. Comp. ch. vi. 5.

Vers. 13-17 relate to social offences of different kinds, common enough in all ages and lands, but all inconsistent with the character of a holy people. Ver. 13 deals with faults of power, "the conversion of might into right." The particulars mentioned are oppression (comp. xxv. 17–43), robbing, and undue retention of wages. The last is spoken of more at length Deut. xxiv. 14, 15. Comp. Jas. v. 4. Ver. 14 mentions crimes of mean advantage. Comp. Deut. xxvii. 18. The sense is, **thou shalt not curse the deaf**, for though he hears not, God will hear and avenge; and so of the blind, God sees and cares for him. Job remembered with satisfaction that in his prosperity he had been "eyes to the blind" and "feet to the lame" (Job xxix. 15). The precept in its literal sense belongs to all times, and so also does its obvious spiritual application, Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 9-13. Lange characterizes this verse as the "sanctification of the human dignity of the infirm." In ver. 15 the Legislator turns to official wrong, guarding against personal influence in judgment from whatever source.—**Respect the person of the poor** has reference not only to pity for him, but to that instinctive tendency to sympathy with the weaker side which still has such powerful influence with the modern jury in the perversion of justice. On the other hand, honoring **the person of the mighty** represents the opposite perversion, perhaps almost equally common, but less creditable to humanity. Vers. 16 and 17 forbid offences of a meaner kind. On ver. 16 Lange says: "Sanctity of a neighbor's good name, and especially of his life and blood. Casting aside of all inhumane conduct, all ill-will, as manifested in malicious belittling, blackening, and slandering, and especially in attempts against the life of a neighbor, whether in court or in private life." The Rabbins, equally with the Hindoo laws, are particularly severe upon the crime of tale-bearing. The Targ. Jonathan paraphrases the clause, "Do not go after the tale-bearing tongue, which is harsh as a sword, slaying with both its edges." The latter clause of ver. 16 is sometimes otherwise interpreted; "most of the recent Jewish versions follow the Talmud in giving another sense to the words, which it appears the Hebrew will bear: *Thou shalt not stand by idly when thy neighbor's life is in danger.* So Zunz, Luzzato, Herxheimer, Leeser, Wogue." Clark. Ver. 17. Lange: "Observance of good-will towards one's neighbor. Blameworthiness of hate, and also of the bitter keeping back of the reproof which one owes to his neighbor. It is a fine reminder that one may become a sharer in a neighbor's fault by a lack of openness, and by a holding back of required reproof." On the last clause, see Textual, and on the whole verse comp. Prov. xxvii. 5; Matt. xviii. 15–17.

In the close of ver. 18 all is summed up in the royal law—**thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.** This is twice quoted by our Lord Himself (Matt. xix. 19; xxii. 39), and, next to love to God, is made the great commandment of

the law. It is repeatedly referred to by the Apostles as the fulfilling of the whole law towards one's neighbor (Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; Jas. ii. 8). It may be that at the time it was given it was too far above the spiritual condition of the people, who must first be trained by the detailed precepts going before. Nevertheless, it is imbedded in the law as the expression of the divine will, and that it might be reached by such as were able to receive it. Such passages as Prov. xxiv. 17, 18; xxv. 21, 22, show that it did not fail of exerting an influence upon the nation, and in later times the Rabbins abundantly recognized it as the very summary of all duty toward's one's neighbor. That the precept has no narrow limitations to their own people is shown by ver. 34, in which it is expressly extended to "the stranger."

The second series of commands, vers. 19–32, is introduced with the formula, **Ye shall keep my statutes,** in which, says Kalisch, the word "**statutes** must be taken in its original and most pregnant sense as that which is 'engraven' and unalterably ordained: you shall not deviate from the appointed order of things, nor abandon the eternal laws of nature as fixed by Divine wisdom." Ver. 19. Lange: "Observance of the natural system, or of the simple laws of nature, symbolically expressed in reference to the tendency to allow the interbreeding of different species of animals, to mix various seeds in the field, and to wear garments made of mixed stuffs. When it is said in regard to these things, **Ye shall keep my statutes,** the laws of nature are plainly meant as the laws of Jehovah, and we must distinguish between the symbolical exemplification of the law and such mixings as nature herself or the necessities of life compel,—to say nothing of the purpose of investigation." This law is repeated in Deut. xxii. 9–11. It is clearly to be looked upon as one of those many educational laws given to train the Israelites to the observance of the natural order and separation of things, to a sense of fitness and congruity; and hence, when the underlying principle has come to be comprehended, the particular details by which it was enforced cease to be obligatory. As to the allegation that this command was violated in the high-priest's dress, which is said to have been woven of linen and wool, it is unnecessary to say more than that the difficulty arises entirely from a misapprehension in taking the word *scarlet* to mean *scarlet wool,* instead of as a simple designation of color.

Vers. 20–22. The punishment for adultery was death for both parties (xx. 10), and the same in case of the seduction of a free virgin who was betrothed (Deut. xxii. 23, 24); and it was still death to the man in case the act might be presumed to have been by violence (*ib.* 25–27). These laws were inapplicable in their full force in the case of a slave, since she could not legally contract marriage. Still, the moral offence existed, and therefore there must be punishment. Versions and authorities vary as to whether the punishment was to be inflicted on both parties (LXX., Vulg., Syr.), on the man alone (Sam.), or on the woman alone (A. V.). The last is supported on the ground that the man's punishment consisted in his trespass offering; but this is so entirely inadequate that this view may be dismissed. Probably both parties were punished when the acquiescence of the woman might be presumed, and the man alone in the opposite case. This would be in accordance with the analogy of Deut. xxii. 23–27, and would account for the indefiniteness of the Hebrew expression. See Textual note 18. The supposition that both were ordinarily to be punished also agrees best with the following plural—**they shall not be put to death.** In the form of sacrifice to be presented by the man, *the trespass offering* (comp. v. 14—vi. 7), the violation of the rights of property of which he had also been guilty is recognized.

Vers. 23–25. "Treatment of nature, in the case of the culture of plants, after their analogy with the life of man. Symbolic practice: the fruits of trees for the first three years were to be considered as the foreskin of the tree, and were not to be harvested nor eaten. The trees were to be allowed to grow strong by having their fruit hang on them. The fruit of the fourth year was to be hallowed to Jehovah, and thus by a theocratic consecration, the fruit of the following years should be a consecrated food, analogous to the food of the flesh that was slain before the door of the Tabernacle. First, the fruits of the trees were, so to speak, heathen; then they were hallowed in a priestly way; and then finally became fruits to be enjoyed by the theocracy." Lange. It is noticeable that this command, like so many others, is wholly prospective,—**when ye shall come into the land,**—one of the constantly recurring evidences that this legislation was actually given during the life in the wilderness.

Vers. 26–28 forbid several heathen customs, some of them associated with idolatrous or superstitious rites, and all of them unbecoming the holy people of God. "To the consecration of the use of fruit is added for completeness once more the consecration of the use of flesh, and indeed with a more strict prohibition of the use of the blood: **ye shall not eat any thing with the blood.**" Lange. "These words were not a mere repetition of the law against eating blood (xvii. 10), but a strengthening of the law. Not only were they to eat no blood, but no flesh to which any blood adhered." Keil. Patrick, quoting from Maimonides and others, makes it very probable that this has reference to a heathen custom of eating flesh over the blood of the animal from which it had been taken as a means of communion with demons who were supposed to feast upon the blood itself. See Spencer, *lib.* II., *c.* 15. **Neither shall ye use enchantment.**—This is a different sin from that forbidden in ver. 31; for in the parallel prohibitions, Deut. xviii. 9-12, the two are distinguished. עׂנַן, primarily *to whisper, to mutter,* covers all kinds of magical formulas, all attempts to secure a desired result otherwise than by natural means or the invocation of divine aid. The LXX. *οὐκ οἰωνιεῖσθε* and Syr. interpret it of augury by means of birds; but while the form of the Hebrew seems to connect the act primarily with the serpent, its sense in use is certainly more general. Comp. Gen. xliv. 5, 15. **Nor observe**

times.—עוֹנֵן, according to some authorities, a *denom.* verb from עָנָן=*a cloud*, and this sense has been followed by the A. V.; according to Rabbinical authorities, however, it is from עַיִן=*the eye*, and means to bewitch with an evil eye. In either case the general sense is in accordance with the preceding clause: to rely upon occult arts for the accomplishment of one's purposes. Lange: "To the prohibition of the unhallowed sensual use of nature is added the prohibition of the demoniacal misinterpretation of nature, of an impious desire to enter the spirit-world by breaking through the opposing limits of nature; the prohibition of soothsaying and sorcery, whereby, in all their forms, natural things were misused, ver. 26. In the same connection belongs the disfiguring of the natural appearance of one's own personal form, especially of the head and the beard, ver. 27. And in this law the Christian world might have cause to see itself reflected, with their unnatural forms of every kind: crinolines, trains, high-heeled shoes, chignons, and hats that are only lids to the forehead. Only the law of customs must be remembered: the taste of the women is the taste of the men." Theodoret (Qu. 28), followed by many moderns, understands the things here forbidden of heathen customs connected either with idolatrous usages or with mourning for the dead. Ver. 28. **For the dead.**—"נֶפֶשׁ מֵת=נֶפֶשׁ, xxi. 11; Num. vi. 6; or מֵת, Deut. xiv. 1; so again [the same form as here is used] in xxii. 4; Num. v. 2; ix. 6, 7, 10." Keil. Lange: "This opposition to nature was increased by cutting marks in their flesh in remembrance of the dead, as the Jews must have seen done in the cultus of the dead among the Egyptians. With this belongs the cutting in of written characters, every kind of tattooing, of profaning the human dignity in the human form. Ver. 28. On similar heathen customs see Keil, p. 130 [Trans. p. 424]; Knobel, p. 513." Comp. xxi. 5; Deut. xiv. But notwithstanding the law, the custom appears to have continued a familiar one, see Jer. xvi. 6; xlviii. 37. "Any voluntary disfigurement of the person was in itself an outrage upon God's workmanship, and might well form the subject of a law." Clark.

Ver. 29. "The common natural disposition becomes especially unnatural when the father of a family gives away his daughter, or allows her to go away, to become a whore. One result of this is that the land or people itself begins to fall to whoredom also in the religious sense. "The religious immorality is here meant, as it was joined with many worships, Num. xxv. 1," *etc.* Knobel. The heathen religious service of lust existed among the most different nations, the Babylonians, for example, and the Indians of the present day." Lange. Keil argues that the reference here can be only "to fleshly whoredom, the word זִמָּה being used only in this connection." But see Ezek. xvi. 27, 43, 58, *etc.* Nevertheless, the context here requires that the carnal sin should be understood, and certainly that is the primary sin in Num. xxv. 1.

Ver. 30. Lange: "The spirit of reverence for the institutions of the church is also a characteristic of true humanity, and the corresponding irreverence, a characteristic of barbarism, even if the barbarism be occasionally in the garments of the higher culture." History has abundantly shown that the keeping holy of the Lord's day and reverence for His sanctuary runs hand in hand with the highest national development. Throughout this "social and domestic life is pervaded by the fear of God and characterized by chasteness and propriety." Keil. In His repeated cleansing of the temple (Jno. ii. 14–16; Matt. xxi. 12, 13) our Lord has shown that the latter duty at least is one of permanent obligation.

Ver. 31. Lange: "Also the passive superstition which, instead of asking of Jehovah, especially on His days of rest and in His holy place, asks of the conjurors of the dead and of wizards, or of any ungodly oracle of any kind, and thus breaks through the limits of the consecrated humanity, which leaves it to God to rule and trusts in God." **Them that have familiar spirits.**—The Heb. אוֹב is used both for the divining spirit, the foreboding demon itself, as here and in xx. 27; 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, 8, *etc.*; and also for the person in whom such a spirit was supposed to dwell, Isa. xxix. 4. The LXX. usually render it by ἐγγαστρίμυθοι=*ventriloquists*, since among the ancients ventriloquism and magical arts were wont to be associated together. **Wizard.**—יִדְּעֹנִי—lit. *the knowing one;* Symm. γνώστης; Aq. γνωριστής, is always associated with אוֹב, and means plainly one who pretends to more than mortal knowledge. The chief means used by both these classes of persons was the consulting with the spirits of the departed. While this furnishes an incidental testimony all along to the belief of the Israelites in the life beyond the grave, it is self-evident that all such attempts to secure knowledge which God has not put it in the power of living man to acquire are a resistance to His will, and a chafing against the barriers He has imposed. It is remarkable that such attempts should have been persisted in through all ages and in all lands. In ver. 32 the outward marks of respect to old age are connected with the fear of God. The commendation of this virtue is frequent in Scripture, and its practice appears to have been universal among all ancient nations, as it is still among the Orientals.

Vers. 33, 34. Lange: "Humanity towards the stranger, who is not a Jew, who thus certainly might dwell as a private man in the future inheritance of Israel. He was to be treated exactly as an inhabitant in human intercourse. **Thou shalt love him as thyself.**—With this the remembrance is still preserved that the Israelites had been strangers in the land of Egypt." The royal law of ver. 18 is here expressly extended to **the stranger**, and notwithstanding the national narrowness necessary to preserve the true religion in the world, the general brotherhood of mankind is hereby taught as far as was possible under the circumstances.

Vers. 35, 36. Lange: "Integrity, corresponding to the humanity, is now made especially prominent and sharp, as if in prophetic foresight in regard to the occupation of the Israelites in trade, and with reference to all forms of business.

"In this mirror of humanity not only Judaism

may see itself reflected, not only mediæval fanaticism, but also modern culture."

The *Ephah* is mentioned as the standard of dry, and the *Hin* of liquid measure. Precisely how much each contained is in dispute. The Hin was the sixth part of the Ephah; and the latter, according to Josephus (*Ant.* III. 9, § 4; VIII. 2, § 9), contained rather more than eight and a half gallons. But the Rabbins make the capacity only about half this, which is more probable. However this may be, it is clear that equity in the affairs of the daily life is here made to rest upon the foundation of duty towards God.

In ver. 37 all duties enumerated in this chapter are placed upon the same ground—the only ground, as experience has abundantly shown, sufficiently strong to withstand the temptations and vicissitudes of the world.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The foundation of the law here, as everywhere, is the holiness of God. Because He is holy, therefore the people who would live in communion with Him must be holy too. This principle is of universal application to all times, and to all occupations of human life.

II. In the human development of holiness filial reverence must always occupy the first place, and next to that comes reverence for the outward institutions of divine appointment.

III. The fulfilling of our whole duty towards our neighbor, under the old dispensation as under the new, culminates and is comprehended in the law—**Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.** With a clearness that seems to belong to the teaching of the Gospel, "neighbor" is made to comprehend **the stranger** as well as one's own compatriots.

IV. In the general exhortation to holiness are included all details of the daily life. There is nothing so insignificant that one may allow himself in unholy conduct in relation to it; because he would thereby violate the fundamental principle of communion with God. This is particularly applied in the law to matters of business and trade.

V. All attempts to arrive at more than mortal knowledge by consultation with the spirits of the dead are especially and emphatically forbidden.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "The foundation of these laws is announced in the most emphatic declaration of the name of Jehovah and His holiness, again and again, as the sanction of the commands. **Ye shall be holy, for I am holy**—*i. e.*, ye shall keep your personality pure, for your Jehovah, your covenant God, the absolute Personality, repels all uncleanness, all confusion with the world, either in the heads of Pantheists or in the hearts and morals of the servants of sin, or in the rites of the priests. The personality is dishonored with every act of idolatry and every idolatrous worship (see Isa. xliv. 9 sqq.; Acts xvii.). There follow the outlines of holy thanksgiving festivals, holy harvest festivals and vintages, holy ways of thought and action, holy oaths, *etc.* Continually new features of the consecration of life by a humane conduct are made prominent; and truly they are fine and thoughtful features."

Each precept of this chapter has a homiletical value so clear that no amplification of the text itself is necessary. Holiness is made to consist not merely in the avoiding of sin and in the fulfilment of certain prescribed duties, but in a general course of life prompted by genuine love. The wants of the poor are to be regarded, the weak and defenceless are to be respected, justice is to be unwarped by either personal sympathies or influence, tale-bearing avoided, all magical arts and efforts to attain forbidden knowledge are to be shunned, and, in a word, man is to conduct himself in all things as one who is in communion with God, and therefore seeks to have His will carried out in all the length and breadth of his own daily life.

FOURTH SECTION.

Punishment for Unholiness.

"Keeping Holy the Holy Congregation by Cutting off Irreparable Transgression."—LANGE.

CHAPTER XX. 1–27.

1, 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Again, thou shalt say to the children
of Israel, Whosoever *he be* of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn
in Israel, that giveth *any* of his seed unto Molech; he shall surely be put to death:
3 the people of the land shall stone him with stones. And I will set my face against
that man, and will cut him off from among his people; because he hath given of
4 his seed unto Molech, to defile my sanctuary, and to profane my holy name. And
if the people of the land do any ways hide[1] their eyes from the man, when he giveth

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 4. On the *daghesh* in הַעְלֵם and יַעְלִימוּ, see Text. Note [10] on iv. 13.

of his seed unto Molech, and kill him not: then I will set my face against that man, and against his family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him, to commit whoredom with Molech, from among their people. And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul,[2] and will cut him off from among his people. Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy: for I *am* the LORD your God.[3] And ye shall keep my statutes, and do them: I *am* the LORD which sanctify you.

For[4] every one that curseth his father or his mother shall be surely put to death: he hath cursed his father or his mother; his blood[5] *shall be* upon him.

And the man that committeth adultery with *another* man's wife, *even he* that commiteth adultery with his neighbor's wife,[6] the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. And the man that lieth with his father's wife hath uncovered his father's nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to death; their blood[5] *shall be* upon them. And if a man lie with his daughter in law, both of them shall surely be put to death; they have wrought confusion; their blood[5] *shall be* upon them. If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood *shall be* upon them. And if a man take a wife and her mother, it *is* wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and they; that there be no wickedness among you. And if a man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death: and ye shall slay the beast. And if a woman approach unto any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman, and the beast: they shall surely be put to death; their blood[5] *shall be* upon them. And if a man shall take his sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness; it *is* a wicked thing; and they shall be cut off in the sight of their people: he hath uncovered his sister's nakedness; he[7] shall bear his iniquity. And if a man shall lie with a woman having her sickness, and shall uncover her nakedness; he hath discovered [uncovered[8]] her fountain, and she hath uncovered the fountain of her blood: and both of them shall be cut off from among their people. And thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister, nor of thy father's sister: for he uncovereth his near kin: they shall bear their iniquity. And if a man shall lie with his uncle's wife, he hath uncovered his uncle's nakedness: they shall bear their sin; they shall die childless. And if a man shall take his brother's wife, it *is* an unclean thing: he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness: they shall be childless.

Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes, and all my judgments, and do them: that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, spue you not out. And ye shall not walk in the manners [statutes[9]] of the nation,[10] which I cast out before you: for they committed all these things, and therefore I abhorred them. But I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land that floweth with milk and honey: I *am* the LORD your God, which have separated you from *other* people. Ye shall therefore put difference between clean beasts and unclean, and between unclean fowls and clean: and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast, or by fowl, or by any manner of living [*omit* living[11]] thing that creepeth on the ground, which I have separated from you as

[2] Ver. 6. בַּנֶּפֶשׁ. Four MSS. and Onk. read בְּאִישׁ, which De Rossi prefers on account of the following אֹתוֹ. For the last, however, the Sam. reads אֹתָהּ.

[3] Ver. 7. The Sam., 4 MSS. and LXX. read: for I, the LORD your God, am holy.

[4] Ver. 9. כִּי=*for* is omitted in two MSS., the LXX. and Vulg.

[5] Vers. 9, 11, 12, 16. On the plural form for *blood*, comp. Gen. iv. 10; Ex. xxii. 1.

[6] Ver. 10. Three of Kennicott's MSS. omit the first clause of this verse. Rosenmüller considers that the repetition involves a distinction for the sake of emphasis, making רֵעַ in the second clause=relation, so that there is a prohibition, first of adultery in general, then specifically of adultery with the wife of a relative. For this sense of the word he refers to Deut. xiii. 7; 2 Sam. xiii. 3. S. Augustine (*Qu.* 73 *in Hept.*) takes the same view.

[7] Ver. 17. The LXX., Syr. and Vulg. have the plural.

[8] Ver. 18. The same word should receive the same translation in both clauses.

[9] Ver. 23. *Statutes.* See Text. Note [2] on xviii. 3.

[10] Ver. 23. The Sam. reads הַגּוֹיִם, and so one MS. followed by all the ancient versions, as seems to be required by the following *they committed*. It is not unlikely that ם may have dropped out of the text.

[11] Ver. 25. There is nothing to express the word *living* in the Heb., and it is better omitted, as the reference is wholly to the dead bodies of these animals.

26 unclean. And ye shall be holy unto me: for I the LORD *am* holy, and have
27 severed you from *other* people, that ye should be mine. A man also or woman that hath a familiar spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood *shall be* upon them.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The whole of Lange's Commentary on this chapter is here given.

"Our section forms a completion of the prohibitions which have preceded in ch. xviii., while it still further joins the punishment of death to several of the very sins there mentioned. Yet this is certainly no mere appendix, but proceeds from an entirely new point of view. There the fundamental idea was: the sexual relations, particularly, the theocratic seed, must be kept holy; here the fundamental idea is: the holy land must be kept holy, it must not be outraged or stirred up to reaction and revolt through an abomination which might determine it to spue out the Israelites also (as a person spues out something nauseous from his mouth), ver. 22. Ch. xviii. 28 had already expressed this thought, but from the point of view that the land would be thereby desecrated. It is also here clearly brought out that the land would be taken away from the Canaanites on account of their constant abominations, and given to the people of Israel; but that the like punishment should befall them also, if they did not keep the land clean by executing the penalty of death upon the offenders. In the conception of the sickened land and the revolted nature lies evidently the idea of the people consumed by unnatural sins." [A simpler view of the relation of this to chs. xviii. and xix. is given by Clark: "The crimes which are condemned in those chapters on purely spiritual ground, the absolute prohibition of Jehovah, have here special punishments allotted to them as offences against the well being of the nation." In ch. xix. there is no mention at all of punishment except in the single case of the betrothed slave (vers. 20-22); in ch. xviii. there is no specific punishment attached to each offence, but only the general statement (vers. 28-30) of the penalty to fall upon the trangressor of any of the statutes and upon the land as a whole. For the purpose of civil government, therefore, the present chapter is a necessary supplement.—F. G.]

"Already (*schon früher*) has the decree of the death-penalty been brought forward for sins that were committed, בְּיָד רָמָה (Num. xv. 30). By this we can only understand stubborn or arrogant sins; therefore not every conscious sin, as opposed to the unconscious, but every sin which was maintained in opposition to the theocratic jurisdiction. Single sins might always prove to be such; but the abominations here mentioned were, for the most part, deadly sins, those most befitting the Cherem, as blaspheming the name of Jehovah, ch. xxiv. 11, and desecrating the Sabbath, Num. xv. 32.

"But also we have here different grades of punishment with the different grades of offence. The first class of sins is devilish, vers. 1-7; the second class brutal, even beastly, vers. 10-16; the third, of the carnal nature, unruly, vers. 17-21.

First Class.

"1. The sacrifice to Molech. It is to be understood that the stranger was included with the Israelite under this prohibition; for if, in general, no sacrifice to false gods were allowed in the land, so certainly not the sacrifice to Molech. The Jew, however, would become more wicked by such an offering than a heathen. It is also here plain that what is spoken of is the giving up of children to death." [The expressions used here, vers. 2, 3, 4, are an abbreviated form of that in xviii. 21. It may be doubted whether they refer to children at all, or if so, to putting them to death. See Textual Note and Comm. on xviii. 21.—F. G.]

"In regard to this, it sounds like a charge to execute immediate judgment on the spot: **the people of the land shall stone him with stones**, properly, bury him under thrown stones." [Doubtless in a primitive state of society all punishment was somewhat summary, and this particular punishment is often provided for in the law, ver. 27; xxiv. 14; Num. xv. 35, 36; Deut. xiii. 10; xvii. 5; xxi. 21; xxii. 21, 24, *etc.* But, nevertheless, it was only to be administered on sufficient evidence, and with due forms of law, Deut. xvii. 6; xix. 15, *etc.*—F. G.]—"In this case the avenging is God's personal affair: Jehovah sets His face against him to consume him out of Jehovah's people; for his sin is a three-fold one: he has given his seed to Molech, and therein has judged himself; he has defiled the sanctuary of Jehovah, that is, the land hallowed by His sanctuary; and he has profaned Jehovah's holy name, and desecrated the religion of His name. And even if the people should let him go unpunished in the last case, Jehovah Himself will pursue him and even his race with His judgment, until He has exterminated all who are associated in his guilt. So strongly rules the absolute Personality against all behaviour that opposed personality. The judgment is in this case as immanent in the guilty as a consuming fire. One might also suppose that "the face of Jehovah," in a *constructio prægnans*, here signified the Angel of His presence, and thus expressed the thought that the spirit of the revealed religion would exterminate the abominations mentioned together with their authors. There were two grades, however, in complicity in this guilt: in the first grade, it is an apostasy to these men (as *e. g.* in the case of heathen wives); in the second grade, through this to Molech. Ver. 5."—[It is noticeable that while the prohibition of the sin in vers. 1-5 extends to the stranger on the ground that such abomination was not to be tolerated at all in the consecrated land; yet the extension of the penalty to complicity in the sin by concealment is applied only to **the people of the land** (ver. 4)—that is, to native Hebrews (comp. iv.

27), and also to them alone (ver. 2) is committed the execution of the penalty.—F. G.]

"2. Also **the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits** (necromancers) **and after wizards** (LXX. ἐγγαστριμυθοί=ventriloquists, ἐπαοιδοί = singing magic charms, both not exegetically exhaustive) **to go a whoring after them** — *i. e.*, to engage in apostasy from Jehovah to dark forms of superstition,—therefore against these also Jehovah will set His face. It helps them nothing if they remain unpunished of men; they fall before the more searching sentence upon presumptuous wickedness. Jehovah pursues them even to their extermination, for they are not to corrupt His people for Him.

"In regard to these sins it is said, on the other hand: **Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy**: raise yourselves to the dignity of theocratic personalities, for your God is in Jehovah, the absolute, pure Personality. While they observe the ordinances of this Holy Being, they must understand that it is He who is training them to be a holy people.

Second Class.

"First Case.—Next the text speaks of the unnatural and profligate child **that curseth his father or his mother. He shall be surely put to death.** And herewith commences the new class. But since the expression begins with **for** (כִּי), it gives to the clause at the same time a symbolic character in reference to the former class: profaning the name of Jehovah is like this sin of cursing father or mother, since He, as the Holy One, creates for Himself His holy people. But for the second class the expression is characteristic, **his blood shall be upon him**, or **upon them**, vers. 9, 11, 12, 13, 16. It is to be observed that ver. 14 brings out an increase in regard to this form of punishment; but ver. 15 certainly falls under one category with ver. 16. The ordinance of punishment, equalizing the guilt of the unnatural curser with that of the shedding of blood, brings upon him the penal retribution of the latter. Ver. 9.

"Second and Third Cases.—The crime of adultery with a neighbor's wife, and the crime of incest with a father's wife (a step-mother) are equalized under the sentence of blood-guiltiness which incurred death, and this for both man and woman alike. Vers. 10, 11.

"Fourth Case.—The same applies to incest with a daughter-in-law, תֵּבֶל (mixing, confusion, defilement). [Ver. 12.]

"Fifth Case.—Pæderasty, moreover, is designated as an abomination, as contrary to nature, a revolting crime; and the punishment of death is here expressly made prominent. This sin is called תּוֹעֵבָה (abomination, horror). [Ver. 13.]

"Sixth Case.—The double incest is made most particularly prominent when a man lies both with a mother and her daughter. They were to be burnt with each other (without doubt, their bodies after they had been stoned). This sin is called זִמָּה (a refined or unheard of deed of shame. The law brings out prominently that such moral enormities should not exist in Israel). The same penalty was, moreover, imposed upon the daughter of a priest who became a whore, because she had put her father to shame, xxi. 9. So Achan was first stoned in the valley of Achor, then burned, since he had brought a curse, a corrupting complicity in guilt upon Israel, Josh. vii. But Josiah set burning against burning, the theocratic burning against the burning to Molech, when he burned the bones of the priests upon their altars, and thereby purified Judah and Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxxiv. 5; comp. 2 Kings xxiii. 10). With this appears the embryo of the Gehenna, as it comes out in symbolic form in the Old Testament, Isa. lxvi. 24. The Gehenna is thus a representation of the fire of Molech, and over it also the fire of judgment has at last come. Ver. 14. The Old Testament fire penalty was only symbolical, and involved no unnatural torture, like the mediæval mimicry of the flames of hell. In this case, the offender was first put to death; and the same is true of the Old Testament hanging.

"Seventh and Eighth Cases.—Copulation with a beast, either by a man or a woman. With the beastly human being, the beast itself was also to be destroyed. For examples, see Knobel, p. 507. [Vers. 15, 16.]

Third Class.

"First Case.—Copulation with a half-sister." [This also, as in xviii. 9, necessarily covers the case of a full sister, for she was both the daughter of the father and the daughter of the mother. —F. G.] "**They shall be cut off in the sight of their people.**—Thus they should form a warning spectacle." Here the crime is described as חֶסֶד and עָוֹן disgrace and misdeed, [Ver. 17.]

"Second Case.—He that lay with a menstruous woman, who in such wise **uncovered the fountain of her blood**—so to speak—exposed her life-spring. The penalty of death is for both. The sentence sounds with a more gentle expression: destruction out of the midst of the people." [Ver. 18. The punishment here refers to the act knowingly committed; in xv. 24 the light penalty is given for the same act unintentionally committed.—F. G.]

"Third Case.—Intercourse with an aunt on either the father's or the mother's side. **They shall bear their iniquity.**—Thus sounds the sentence indefinitely, in transition to the following. [Ver. 19.]

"Fourth Case.—If one takes the wife of his brother, it is נִדָּה (it induces the curse of the first degree); The penalty is childlessness, and is thus entirely a divine dispensation (ver. 21). Here, as has been said, the prohibition can, in the case of the Levirate marriage (Deut. xxv. 5–10), become a command—an evidence of the nicety of the law." [On the meaning of the penalty of childlessness see the preliminary note to ch. xviii. It would be entirely out of analogy with the Divine dealings with man to suppose a perpetual special interposition through all the ages of Israel's history in every case of violation

of this law, and there is nothing in the character of the forbidden relation to induce childlessness under those ordinary Divine appointments which we call natural laws. It is also much more in accordance with the general character of this chapter that the penalty should be understood of something inflicted by statute law,—the reckoning of the issue of such marriages to another than the actual father. So rightly S. Augustin, *Qu.* 76 *in Hept.* It is a striking fact that this penalty was still carried out in the one case of the prohibited degrees, when the prohibition was changed to a command. In the Levirate marriage no heirs were begotten to the actual father, but they were reckoned to the deceased brother.—F. G.]

"In conclusion, another exhortation follows which, in the first place, marks out the ordinances as **judgments** (ideas); secondly, expresses the incongruity between the unnatural behaviour and the nature of the land of God, for which even Israel could be spued out from it; and this brings out, in the third place, that for such very things the heathen were thrust out of the land. To this threat a promise is appended in conclusion. [Ver. 24.] And with this is connected a noble idea: in the separation of clean beasts from the unclean, the separation of Israel from the heathen is to be symbolically mirrored forth. The closing sentence [ver. 27] would be unintelligible as a repetition (from chap. xix. 31); evidently it is the germ of the prohibition of false enthusiasm and prophecy in Israel itself (see Deut. xix. 11 sqq.)." [In xix. 31, in accordance with the general character of chaps. xviii. and xix., we have simply the prohibition on the spiritual ground of the opposition to God's will, without mention of specific punishments; here we have throughout civil penalties attached to the various offences as against the theocratic state. Accordingly those that have familiar spirits or are wizards require to be mentioned again in order that the death penalty may be denounced against them.—F. G.]

"Ver. 25 is particularly important, since it contains the key to the understanding of the Levitical distinction between clean and unclean animals. Men have sought for physiological reasons for this distinction, and quite lately an Israelitish author has referred to the discovery of the *Trichina* as the foundation of the prohibition of swine's flesh. In regard to many of the unclean animals, there is indeed the reason of the physiological unhealthiness of the flesh, or of the physical aversion to their hateful appearance; to which may be added, as connected, something of the physical effect of the blood of wild beasts. Also the limitation of Israel to the use and sacrifice of domestic animals must have an economic significance, and be, so to speak, for the benefit of the State, since it worked against the dissipations of the ancient hunting and the luxury of the heathen, and with the cultivation of the land, furthered at the same time domestic simplicity and contentment." [This must be understood to apply only in a limited degree to the Israelites; for they were allowed freely to hunt and eat all *clean* wild animals, as the "roebuck and the hart" (Deut. xii. 15, *etc.*). In regard to all physiological and other reasons, it is always to be remembered that no animals are intrinsically unclean; none were excepted from the grant to Noah, and none from the Christian abrogation of the distinction. The law was wholly temporary, added "because of transgressions," to constitute Israel a peculiar people.—F. G.] "But the symbolic meaning of the animal world, as a representation of Israel among the Gentiles, is here expressly brought out as the religious main reason. Israel was to have a constant representation of its separation from the heathen world in the separation of the clean animals, and thus also the heathen world, by which it was surrounded, and from which it was to understand that it differed in religion and in morals, was to be represented in the sphere of the unclean animals. The sacred observance of the laws of food was thus a constant reminder for Israel of its theocratic sanctity and dignity. Thus it is plain that the old distinction between clean and unclean animals must fall away after the boundary between Israel and the heathen has fallen. But it is also to be recollected that Judaism clung very strongly to the old distinction, as it did no less to the prohibition of the use of blood; and the Apostolic ordinance in regard to the last particular and cognate subjects is explained to mean that these laws, which had been ended as religious dogmas, must yet continue for a time as Christian customs for the sake of a united Christian fellowship. The shadowing forth of the heathen world in the world of unclean beasts, which is here *expressly* brought out, is denied by Keil, in opposition to Kurtz, without reason (p. 95)." [Much as we may admire the beauty and force of the symbolism here presented by Lange, it is difficult to see how it "is here expressly brought out," or even in any way alluded to in the text. Certainly the observance of the distinction among animals is placed upon a religious ground, and this observance would contribute to make of Israel that separate people which God had called them to be. Naturally then might the Israelites themselves have compared the heathen to unclean animals; but so far is such an idea from finding countenance in the word of God that it is only recognised to be removed, and the heathen are first represented as unclean animals in the vision of St. Peter (Acts x. 10-16) at the moment when such distinctions were forever to be done away. The object of the law was to make the distinction of animals fixed and unalterable; but in regard to the heathen, to encourage them to offer sacrifices and partake in the worship of God, and thus to be drawn into ever increasing nearness of relation to Him.—F. G.]

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. In chap. xviii. the law is given simply as the will of God. Here punishments are attached to disobedience as to civil offences against the theocratic state. There seems no reason why these two chapters should have been separated except to mark this distinction emphatically. Obedience to God's law is required simply because it is His will, and this is set forth by itself; afterwards and separately, punishments are provided for those among His people who refuse to be guided by Him.

II. In the frequent expression **his** or **their blood shall be upon him** or **them** is a plain intimation that the offender alone is responsible for the evil that comes upon him. The divine law, whether natural or revealed, is inexorable, and he who thrusts himself across its path necessarily incurs its penalties. There is no occasion for a Divine interposition to punish, and there is no room for the charge of severity; the offender braves an irresistible will, and in doing this must himself alone be held responsible for the result.

III. The beast involved in the guilt of man or woman must be put to death with them. There could be no moral guilt on the part of the beast, because there was no moral responsibility; but yet he must perish because he had been associated in human sin. Whether this was in order to remove the tool of sin from sight simply, or whether it was because of the association of human sin with the beast; in either case it is plain that it was commanded not for the sake of the beast, but of man. Here we have one of the many instances in the law in which human associations and feelings are cared for and protected, and used also as means for the advancement of holiness.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "The chapter of the great theocratic rigor (chap. xx.) forms a contrast to the chapter of the great theocratic mildness and purity of life. Here the various measures of punishment come into consideration. Burning with fire, as a symbolical addition to the punishment of death, is only connected with the dead body which has been put to death by stoning. Then follows the particular capital punishment; and next to this indefinite forms of punishment, **he shall bear his iniquity**; and finally the punishment of childlessness, in which also we are certainly to suppose a physical basis. The conception of the abominations is the conception of that which is against nature (Rom. i.), of that which, even according to natural instinct, is perverse, horrible, and a revolt against the moral law in man's nature; but in regard to this, indeed, nature itself comes to the judgment like a spirit of retribution."

The law of this, as of many other chapters, is enforced on the ground that the Israelites were called to be a *holy* people. With how great additional force must this apply to Christians. Not only the Israelite, but the stranger also, defiled God's sanctuary and profaned His holy name by sin. The same thing must be true always; there is no escape from responsibility because one chooses not to acknowledge allegiance to God. The Divine commands still rest upon him. Only he has less help and support in keeping them while he remains aloof from the commonwealth of Israel.

PART SECOND.

Holiness on the Part of the Priests and Holiness of the Offerings.

"*The sacred observance of the priestly position, of the sacrifice, and of the priestly calling.*"—LANGE.

CHAPTERS XXI., XXII.

A.—"THE DESECRATION OF THE PRIESTLY POSITION AND THE PRIESTLY CALLING."—LANGE.

CHAPTER XXI.

1 AND the LORD said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and
2 say unto them, There shall none be defiled for the dead among his people: but for
his kin, that is near unto him, *that is,* for his mother, and for his father, and for his
3 son, and for his daughter, and for his brother, and for his sister a virgin, that is
4 nigh unto him, which hath had no husband; for her may he be defiled. *But* [*omit but*] he shall not defile himself, *being* a chief man[1] among his people, to profane

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 4. לֹא יִטַּמָּא בַּעַל בְּעַמָּיו. The interpretation of this obscure clause is very various. The LXX., mistaking בַּעַל, read οὐ μιανθήσεται ἐξαπίνα ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, meaning that the priest shall not defile himself rashly or lightly. The Syr. and Vulg. have transferred the preposition בְּ from עַמָּיו to בַּעַל and read *but he shall not be defiled for a prince, etc.*, a sense adopted by several expositors. The A. V. has followed the Targ. of Onk. and the Arab., which is interpreted to mean that the priest, as occupying a high official position, head of a family, *etc.*, should not defile himself; if this sense can be sustained, it throws some light upon the occasional use of כֹּהֵן for *prince*. It is adopted by many expositors, as Von Gerlach and Keil. The Targ. Jonathan, and several Jewish expositors (Kalisch also, and Knobel) understand בַּעַל to mean *husband*, a sufficiently well-established meaning of the word, and one which is followed in the margin of the A. V.;

himself. They[2] shall not make baldness upon their head, neither shall they shave
off the corner of their beard, nor make any cuttings in their flesh. They shall be
holy unto their God, and not profane the name of their God: for the offerings of
the LORD made by fire, *and* [*omit and*[3]] the bread of their God they do offer: there-
fore they shall be holy.[4]
They shall not take a wife *that is* a whore, or profane: neither shall they take a
woman put away from her husband: for he[5] *is* holy unto his God. Thou shalt
sanctify him therefore; for he offereth the bread of thy God: he shall be holy unto
thee: for I the LORD, which sanctify you,[6] *am* holy. And the daughter of any
priest, if she profane herself by playing the whore, she profaneth her father: she
shall be burnt with fire.
And *he that is* the high priest among his brethren, upon whose head the anointing
oil was poured, and that is consecrated to put on the garments, shall not uncover
his head, nor rend his clothes; neither shall he go in to any dead body, nor defile
himself for his father, or for his mother; neither shall he go out of the sanctuary,
nor profane the sanctuary of his God; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God
is upon him: I *am* the LORD. And he shall take a wife in her virginity. A
widow, or a divorced woman, or profane, *or*[7] an harlot, these shall he not take: but
he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife. Neither shall he profane his seed
among his people: for I the LORD do sanctify him.
And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, saying, Whoso-
ever *he be* of thy seed in their generations that hath *any* blemish, let him not ap-
proach to offer the bread of his God. For whatsoever man *he be* that hath a blem-
ish, he shall not approach: a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a flat nose, or
any thing superfluous, or a man that is brokenfooted, or brokenhanded, or crook-
backt, or a dwarf,[8] or that hath a blemish in his eye, or be scurvy, or scabbed, or
hath his stones broken; no man that hath a blemish of the seed of Aaron the priest
shall come nigh to offer the offerings of the LORD made by fire: he hath a blemish;
he shall not come nigh to offer the bread of his God. He shall eat the bread of
his God, *both* of the most holy, and of the holy. Only he shall not go in unto the
vail, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath a blemish; that he profane not
my sanctuaries:[9] for I the LORD do sanctify them. And Moses told *it* unto Aaron,
and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel.

but this requires *for his wife* to be supplied, for which there is no warrant, and it also seems highly improbable that mourning should be permitted for the relations mentioned in vers. 2, 3, and forbidden for the wife. Michaelis understands the high-priest to be intended by בַּיַּעַל; but his conduct is the special subject of vers. 10-12. On the whole, no other interpretation seems sufficiently well-established to take the place of that in the A. V., although even that can hardly be considered as satisfactory. In any case it is better to omit the interpolated *but* at the beginning of the verse.

2 Vers. 5. The K'ri יִקְרְחוּ indicated by the Masoretic punctuation of the text יִקָּרְחָה is sustained by the Sam. and all the versions.

3 Ver. 6. The sense is rather obscured than helped by the interpolated *and*, which is better omitted.

4 Ver. 6. The Heb. has קֹדֶשׁ in the sing., doubtless to be understood as an abstract term. The Sam. and all the versions have the plural.

5 Vers. 7, 8. The *enallage* of numbers creates a slight obscurity, but the A. V. faithfully follows the Heb.

6 Ver. 8. The Sam., LXX., and Vulg., have the pronoun in the third person

7 Ver. 14. The missing conjunction is supplied in the Sam. and the versions.

8 Ver. 20. דַּק signifies something *small* or *thin*. The text of the A. V., seems preferable to the margin, as it is scarcely to be supposed that the case of the dwarf would be omitted. Fuerst, however, renders it *consumptive;* Vulg., *blear-eyed*, and so Onk., and apparently the LXX. ἔφηλος. Syr. = *little*.

9 Ver. 23. The LXX. has the sing. τὸ ἅγιον. The plural is generally understood to signify the holy place and the holy of holies; some interpreters, however, (Boothroyd, Rosenmueller) would translate *my hallowed things*.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Lange: "The symbolic side of the Levitical law, which was brought out so powerfully at the close of the last chapter, is likewise not to be mistaken in the commands for keeping holy the priestly calling. Owing to the symbolic meaning of these commands they are connected by manifold analogies with heathen laws and customs enacted to secure the priestly dignity. Compare the references on this subject in Knobel, p. 517 sqq.; Keil, p. 141." [Trans. p. 430, 432. "The testimonies which Knobel and several of the older commentators have collected to show that the priests of the Egyptians, Greeks, Romans and other nations avoided funerals and contact with the dead, afford but an imperfect parallel to these Levitical laws concerning the priests . . . . . Wherever this feeling was recognized in a ceremonial usage, the priest, from his office, would naturally be expected to observe the highest standard of purity. But the laws which regulated the priesthood of the chosen

people had a deeper basis than this. They had to administer a law of life. . . . St. Cyril truly observes that the Hebrew priests were the instruments of the divine will for averting death, that all their sacrifices were a type of the death of Christ, which swallowed up death in victory, and that it would have been unsuitable that they should have the same freedom as other people to become mourners. *Glaphyra* in Lev., p. 430." Clark.—F. G.].

"In the first place it is to be noticed that there is here brought out a gradation of the symbolism that the laws in regard to dignity are stronger in the case of the high-priest than in the case of the sons of Aaron, the common priests. While these, who were at first Aaron's sons, were elevated above the common people (as this also outranked the heathen in its sanctity), so the high-priest again was raised above his sons; he formed the symbolical centre and summit of the personal sanctity towards God, and of exclusion as respects the unclean or that which was Levitically 'common.'" Lange.

With this chapter begins a new *Parashah*, or Proper Lesson of the law extending through ch. xxiv. "The parallel *Haphtarah*, or Proper Lesson of the Prophets, is Ezek. xliv. 15-31, which contains ordinances for the priests, and is the best commentary on the present chapter." Wordsworth.

The purity and holiness required of the priesthood in this chap. is evidently a necessary consequence of the peculiar relation in which they stood to God and the people. It is substantially the same as that required of all the holy people, but is emphasized and extended somewhat beyond that which the people generally were able to bear, because it especially devolved upon them to "draw nigh unto the Lord." For the same reason still more strict obligations are laid upon the high-priests. In vers. 1-6 they are forbidden to defile themselves by touching the dead, or by signs of mourning; in 7-9 they are required to contract a spotless marriage and maintain purity in their families; in 10-15 the same duties, somewhat extended, are still more emphatically required of the high-priest; and in conclusion, vers. 16-24, the physical impediments to the exercise of the priestly office are detailed.

Vers. 1–4. The priest may not defile himself on account of a dead person (נֶפֶשׁ lit. *a soul*), with an exception however in the case of the very nearest of kin. The virgin sister, as yet unbetrothed, is included in the list; but after her betrothal or marriage, she passed into the family of another, and the exemption ceases. The principle of the exception seems to be simply a regard for human feelings. The fact that the tent or house was defiled, *ipso facto*, by the presence of a dead body, and therefore the priest could not avoid defilement in such cases (Keil) forms no sufficient explanation of the exception; for this would be true when a slave died in the house, which is not included, and would often not be true in the case of a father, which is included. It is remarkable that there is no mention of the wife—the Rabbins say because she and her husband were "one flesh." Lange (see below) makes a distinction between a passive defilement which was inevitable in the case of a death in the house, and which is too self-evident to require especial mention; and the active defilement of proclaiming one's grief, using the customary marks of mourning and burying the dead, which he considers were forbidden to the priest, as belonging to the class of the chief men, on occasion of the death of his wife. It seems more probable that the instances mentioned in ver. 2 are of the nature of limitations, and that the marriage relationship is not mentioned because it is nearer than any of them, and therefore included within them all. Notwithstanding the permission in the cases mentioned above, the priest, by contact with the dead, still became defiled for seven days, and was then required to offer a sin offering (see Ezek. xliv. 25-27). No penalty is provided for a violation of this law. On ver. 4 see Textual Notes.

Vers. 5, 6. The prohibition to the priests of the marks of mourning for the dead, customary among the surrounding nations, is extended in Deut. xiv. 1 to the whole body of the people. The command to the priests is expressly made to rest upon their official duties. On the expression **bread of their God** see on iii. 11. לֶחֶם is indifferently rendered in the A. V. *food*, *bread*, and *meat*. Only the last is objectionable on account of the change in the use of the English word.

Vers. 7–9. The marriage of the priests and the life of their families likewise must not be allowed to present a contrast to their holy calling. They might marry any reputable woman, whether Israelite or foreigner, excepting of course women from those idolatrous tribes of the Canaanites which were forbidden to all the people. Exod. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3. In after times this law was made more stringent, Ezek. xliv. 22. They might not take to wife a common prostitute, nor one **profane**, *i. e.*, a woman who had fallen, or as some Jewish authorities hold, one of illegitimate birth. Briefly, their wives must be of unblemished and spotless character, and hence they were forbidden to take one already repudiated. In ver. 8 the change of person is generally held to indicate a change of address to the people of Israel; but this is unnecessary. It is simply the ordinary form of direct command. Because it was the priest's office to offer **the bread of thy God**, therefore his life and surroundings must be in harmony with his holy calling. The priest's family, also, by a propriety felt in all ages, must be ordered in accordance with his sacred duties, and the outrageous violation of this in his daughter's becoming a prostitute must not only be punished with death, but the dead body be visited with the symbolical punishment of burning.

Vers. 10–15. The same commands are applied with greater emphasis, and with some extension, to the high-priest. He is described by the peculiar fulness of the anointing he had received (vers. 10, 12), and by his being **consecrated to put on the garments**, *viz.*, those appointed for the official costume of the high-priest, in which Aaron had been arrayed at his consecration, and which descended to his successors. To him the accustomed marks of mourning, and all

contact with a dead body, even that of the nearest relative, are forbidden. He must not **go out of the sanctuary** for this purpose (not that the sanctuary was to be his constant abode, Bähr and Baumgarten), nor **profane the sanctuary** by this defilement of his person. He was also restricted in marriage to a virgin of Israel, ver. 14; by any other marriage he would **profane his seed.**

Lange: "Whatever may belong to the defilement by the dead, it is certainly to be noticed that nothing is here said in any way of dying persons, or of death itself, but of dead bodies. The recollection of Egypt, especially of the Egyptian cultus of dead bodies comes here into the foreground. The defilement by the dead included not merely the touching in itself, which is so natural to excited grief, but also the participation in the burial, and the customs of mourning. But that which among the heathen was an expression of horror, so that it was said even of Apollo himself, Let him shun the scenes of death, appears here rather as a prelude of the sublimity of the Christian view of death. The horror would indeed appear strongest at the sight of the dead body of a blood relative, yet here humanity places itself on the opposite side as a limit of the symbolism, and allows the defilement in the case of the nearest family relations with the exception of the married sister who now belongs to another family circle. Ver. 4 certainly appears to say that a man as a husband shall not defile himself for the dead body of his wife, as the foregoing specification and determination concerning the married sister might already intimate. Concerning this, see below," [above under ver. 4]. "The reason is well expressed in ver. 6: **for the offerings of the LORD made by fire, the bread of their God they do offer.**—Since they know, or at least have some idea of what the sacrifice signifies—an entire resignation to the living God,—they cannot mourn and despair as those who have little or no hope, without strengthening the delusion of despair, by which the Israelites would dishonor the name of their God, Jehovah. There is an extravagance of lamentation which takes the appearance of a resentment and contention with God in regard to the dead; among the people of God this should be excluded by the feeling of reverence:—the Lord has done it.

"Three kinds of women are excluded from the priestly marriage: the **whore,** the **profane,** the **divorced.** To the high-priest the taking of a widow is also forbidden. We call to mind Thamar, Rahab, Ruth, and Bathsheba, who became ancestors in Israel (Matt. i.), and it is thus plain that the subject is here a purely Old Testament regulation of symbolical signification. By the marriage of the priest with a virgin is signified that the theocratic marriage could and should be consecrated to the rearing up of the hereditary blessing (see Jno. i. 13, 14). Thus also he was to appear to the people as a consecrated personality. But the dark contrast is the ruined priestly family,* and the saddest instance is the ruined priest's daughter; if she has only begun to be a whore, she has fallen under the judgment of fire.

"The third division treats of the sons of the priests having bodily defects, or afflicted with corporeal blemishes (wherein spiritual reasons are evidently included). Here also the prevailing symbolical purpose is not to be mistaken. The sacrificers must appear as the type of perfection, as also the sacrifice in the following section. Hence the blind and lame, the sons of Aaron with misshapen noses and limbs, having some bodily defect in hand or foot, *etc.* (vers. 18-20) correspond to the faulty sacrificial animals, ch. xxii. 23-25. The strong exclusion demanded by the cultus for the sake of its symbolism was compensated by the compassionate provision that they should have their portion of all sacrificial food of the active priests, whereby they are in some sort to be compared with *Emeritus* officials who draw their full salary. They do not offer **the bread of their God,** as the offerings are collectively called, inasmuch as these culminated in the shew-bread; but yet they eat **the bread of their God,** as well of the most holy as of the holy, *i. e.*, not only of the wave offerings, firstlings, *etc.* (Num. xviii. 11, 19, and 26–29) but also of the peculiar priestly portion of the sacrifices, the oblations, *etc.* See Keil, p. 34 [Trans. p. 433]. But if the priestly access **unto the vail** and **unto the altar** is denied them, it appears that this is here spoken of their official functions. Moreover it is emphasized that Moses communicated these commands not only **unto Aaron and to his sons;** but **unto all the children of Israel** who ought to know how their priests should conduct themselves." Lange.

A death in a dwelling defiled every thing in the dwelling, and every one who entered it. Deaths, however, must necessarily occur in priestly families beyond the limits of the allowable cases of defilement, and also in the house of the high-priest to whom no defilement whatever was allowed. Lange therefore well says, "A distinction must be made between passive sorrow and defilement, which might happen even to the high-priest in his own house, and active uncleanness which came about by the rending of the clothes and going to the dead body." Accordingly the prohibition to the high-priest is couched in terms (vers. 10–12) indicating the active defilement.

Vers. 16–24. These directions concerning the descendants of Aaron who should have any bodily defect are founded upon the general principle, appearing in every part of the law, that whatever is devoted to the service of God should be as perfect as possible in its kind. "As the spiritual nature of a man is reflected in his bodily form, only a faultless condition of body could correspond to the holiness of the priest; just as the Greeks and Romans required, for the very same reason, that the priests should be ὁλόκληροι, *integri corporis* (Plato *de legg.* 6, 759; Seneca *excerpt. controv.* 4, 2; Plutarch *quæst. rom.* 73). Consequently none of the descendants of Aaron **in their generations,** *i. e.*, in all future generations (see Ex. xii. 14), were to approach the vail, *i. e.*, enter the holy place, or draw near to the altar (in the court) to offer the food of Jehovah, *viz.*, the sacrifices." Keil. Persons thus in-

* "Or also the family of a pastor. In a poem by Heine it is depicted with dark touches."

capacitated for the exercise of the active duties of the priesthood are yet especially allowed to partake of the priests' portion of the sacrifices (ver. 22), and doubtless received their share of the tithes for the support of the priests. By custom they were employed in many duties pertaining to the priesthood which did not require the prohibited approach to the altar or entrance into the holy place; such as the examination of leprous persons, houses, and things, the carrying of the ashes without the camp, and many duties of a similar character.

At the beginning of the chapter Moses is directed to make this communication **to the priests the sons of Aaron**; at the end (ver. 24) we read that he told it not only to them, but **unto all the children of Israel.** This is in accordance with the whole character of the law. Each particular communication is immediately addressed to those whose duties it concerns; but at the same time, no part of the law was to be the exclusive possession, or under the exclusive guardianship of any class. Every part of it was to be diligently taught to every Israelite. The Divine law was the common heritage of all, and all were interested in seeing that it was observed.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. All the precepts of this chapter tend to a single point—the peculiar purity and symbolical holiness required of those who ministered before God. From the centre of the absolute Divine holiness spread out ever-widening circles, and to each is attached a minimum of symbolical holiness without which it cannot be entered. The heathen in the outermost circle, as human beings, still had the light of nature and conscience; these laid upon them duties for the violation of which they were cast out of their homes and destroyed; the people of Israel formed an inner circle of higher obligations; but those chosen from them to draw nigh to God on their behalf, must come under a still stricter rule. All this points unmistakably to the holiness of Him who is the centre of all, and shows that the partaking of His holiness is the necessary condition of approach to Him.

II. The families of the priests were so intimately associated with their own proper personality, that something of the requirements for the priests themselves must also be demanded of them. This rests upon a fundamental principle of fitness, and is again repeatedly insisted upon in the New Testament in regard to the Christian minister. See 1 Tim. iii. 11, 12; Tit. i. 6.

III. The absolute holiness required of those who presented offerings to God could be only symbolical; but the fact that it was symbolical points to One who fulfilled the symbolism, even to Christ, who was alone perfect in holiness; therefore through Him alone can any acceptable gifts be offered to God.

V. Physical blemishes, because they symbolized spiritual defects, hindered the priests from ministering before God on man's behalf; yet these did not prevent their eating of the sacrifices, thus at once receiving their own support, and representing God in the receiving of that which the sacrificer offered. Thus is brought out the two-fold relation in those who minister for the people toward God: on the one hand they may only draw nigh to Him on the basis of perfect holiness, and for sinful man this can be accomplished only through the mediation of Christ; on the other, the grace proceeding from Him is not hindered by the unworthiness of those through whom it comes. Always we must "have this treasure in earthen vessels." The feeble stream from man to God would be turned back by the obstacles in its channel but for the all-availing efficacy of the intercession of Christ; but the full flow of God's mercies in Christ is powerful enough to sweep by all such barriers.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

"The person, life and house of the priest must especially be kept holy. For this, the law of God knows a more human way than the law of the Pope (xxi. 13). The features of the symbolical consecrated state of the priest are spiritually explained. The fearful picture of a desecrated, profane, or very vicious priestly house. How far also can the sacrifice be designated as the bread of God? In reference to the Being of God Himself, the true sacrifice is an object of His good pleasure. In reference to the power of God, it is the noblest and most fitting means of drawing near to His fire. In reference to the idea of God in the world, it is a perpetual means of freshening, deepening, and strengthening it." Lange.

The priestly requirement of holiness, symbolical of old for those whose office it was to draw near to God, must rest now in its literal force upon all Christians, "a royal priesthood," who must ever draw near by the new and living way consecrated for them. As the headship of the priest over his household required that they also should present no striking contrast to his purity; so, on the same principle, it must be incumbent upon all men that those over whom they have influence and control should be so ordered in their lives as not to present to the world a contrast to the principles they themselves profess.

Excessive mourning is forbidden to the priests; all mourning is restricted to the circle of the nearest relations, and to the high-priest is forbidden altogether. Thus is clearly shown that however on earth something may be conceded to the weakness of sorrowing humanity, yet sorrow for the departed is not the proper garb in which to draw near to God. This is more fully declared through Him who is the Resurrection and the Life, and the Christian cannot sorrow for those who sleep in Him as men without hope. Thus the reproof of excessive indulgence in sorrow, so plainly brought out under the new dispensation, is here foreshadowed by the laws of the Mosaic covenant.

In ver. 24 we see that, although the priests were separated from the people by their special divine appointment, the laws for their government were yet communicated to all the people that they might be under the observation of the whole community in their conduct. So it must ever be if the ministry is to be preserved in its purity; and the germs of decay are already sown in that body which refuses to recognize its responsibility to the public opinion of the Christian community.

B.—"KEEPING HOLY OF THE SACRIFICE, OR OF WHAT HAS BEEN HALLOWED."—LANGE.

CHAPTER XXII. 1–33.

1, 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from the holy things of the children of Israel, and that they profane not my holy name *in those things* which they hallow unto me: I
3 *am* the LORD. Say unto them, Whosoever *he be* of all your seed among your generations, that goeth unto the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall be cut off from
4 my presence: I *am* the LORD. What man soever of the seed of Aaran *is* a leper, or hath a running issue; he shall not eat of the holy things, until he be clean. And whoso toucheth any thing *that is* unclean *by* the dead, or a man whose seed
5 goeth from him; or whosoever toucheth any[1] creeping thing, whereby he may be made unclean, or a man of whom he may take uncleanness,[2] whatsoever uncleanness
6 he hath; the soul which hath touched any such shall be unclean until even, and
7 shall not eat of the holy things, unless he wash [bathe[3]] his flesh with water. And when the sun is down, he shall be clean, and shall afterward eat of the holy things;
8 because it *is* his food. That which dieth of itself, or is torn *with beasts*, he shall
9 not eat to defile himself therewith: I *am* the LORD. They shall therefore keep mine ordinance,[4] lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore, if they profane it: I the LORD do sanctify them.
10 There shall no stranger eat *of* the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest, or an
11 hired servant, shall not eat *of* the holy thing. But if the priest buy *any* soul with his money, he shall eat of it, and he[5] that is born in his house: they shall eat of
12 his meat [food[6]]. If the priest's daughter also be *married* unto a stranger, she
13 may not eat of an offering of the holy things. But if the priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child, and is returned unto her father's house, as[7] in her youth, she shall eat of her father's meat [food[6]]: but there shall no stranger
14 eat thereof. And if a man eat *of* the holy thing unwittingly [inadvertently[8]], then he shall put the fifth *part* thereof unto it, and shall give *it* unto the priest with the
15 holy thing. And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel,
16 which they offer[9] unto the LORD; or suffer them to bear the iniquity of trespass, when they eat [or, lade themselves with the iniquity of trespass in their eating[10]] their holy things: for I the LORD do sanctify them.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 5. The Sam. and LXX. supply the word *unclean*. According to the law, the "creeping thing" could only communicate uncleanness when dead.

[2] Ver. 5. Rosenmüller translates: *or a man who may be unclean on account of it, sc.* the creeping thing. He refers the pronoun in לוֹ to שֶׁרֶץ.

[3] Ver. 6. רָחַץ. See Textual Note [30] on xiv. 8.

[4] Ver. 9. שָׁמְרוּ אֶת־מִשְׁמַרְתִּי. The want of an appropriate verb and noun from the same root in English makes it impossible to give the full force of this phrase so often impressively repeated. See Gen. xxvi. 5; Lev. viii. 35; Num. iii. 7; ix. 19. Lange uses a paraphrase: *Und sie sollen beobachten, was gegen mich zu beobachten ist.*

[5] Ver. 11. The Sam., LXX. and Chald. have the plural.

[6] Ver. 11. בַּלַּחְמוֹ. See Com. on xxi. 6. On the *daghesh* in the מ see Textual Note [10] on iv. 13.

[7] Ver. 13. Sixteen MSS. for the particle of comparison כְּ have בְּ.

[8] Ver. 14. בִּשְׁגָגָה. See Textual Note [1] on iv. 2.

[9] Ver. 15. יָרִימוּ, lit. *which they heave* or *lift up*; but evidently the reference is more general than to the heave-offerings, and the *offer* of the A. V. is by all means to be retained.

[10] Ver. 16. The sense of this verse is doubtful. The A. V., Patrick, Pool, Keil and others refer the pronouns *them* and *they* to the people, and understand the precept that the priests should prevent the people from eating of the holy things which it belonged to the priests to eat; on the other hand, the margin of the A. V., Calvin, Knobel, Zunz, Riggs and Lange understand it as meaning *lade themselves with the iniquity of trespass in their eating.* The latter is more in accordance with the general subject of the chapter, and is preferable. So the LXX. understood by the use of ἑαυτούς. So Houbigant.

17, 18 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them, Whatsoever *he be* of the house of Israel, or of the strangers[11] in Israel, that will offer his oblation [offering[12]] for all [any of] his vows, and for all [any of] his free-will offerings, which they
19 will offer unto the LORD for a burnt offering; *ye shall offer* at your own will [for your acceptance[13]] a male without blemish, of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the
20 goats. *But* whatsoever hath a blemish, *that* shall ye not offer: for it shall not be
21 acceptable for you. And whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD to accomplish *his* vow, or a freewill offering in beeves or sheep [of the flock[14]],
22 it shall be perfect to be accepted: there shall be no blemish therein. Blind, or broken, or maimed,[15] or having a wen [or ulcerous[16]], or scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto the LORD, nor make an offering by fire of them upon the
23 altar unto the LORD. Either a bullock or a lamb [one of the flock[17]] that hath anything superfluous[18] or lacking in his parts, that mayest thou offer *for* a freewill
24 offering; but for a vow it shall not be accepted. Ye shall not offer unto the LORD that which is bruised, or crushed, or broken, or cut; neither shall ye make *any*
25 *offering thereof* [make *such*[19]] in your land. Neither from a stranger's[20] hand shall ye offer the bread of your God of any of these; because their corruption *is* in them, *and* blemishes *be* in them: they shall not be accepted for you.
26, 27 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, When a bullock, or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thenceforth it shall be accepted for an offering made by fire unto
28 the LORD. And *whether it be* cow or ewe [female of the flock[21]], ye shall not kill it and her young both in one day.
29 And when ye will offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving unto the LORD, offer *it* at
30 your own will [for your acceptance[13]]. On the same day it shall be eaten up; ye shall leave none of it until the morrow: I *am* the LORD.
31 Therefore shall ye keep my commandments, and do them: I *am* the LORD.
32 Neither shall ye profane my holy name; but I will be hallowed among the chil-
33 dren of Israel: I *am* the LORD which hallow you, that brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: I *am* the LORD.

[11] Ver. 18. The Sam., 14 MSS., and all the ancient versions supply *that sojourn.*

[12] Ver. 18. קָרְבָּן. See Textual Note [2] on ii. 1.

[13] Ver. 19. לִרְצֹנְכֶם. See Textual Note [5] on i. 3. Comp. also ver. 21.

[14] Ver. 21. בַּצֹּאן includes both *sheep* (A. V.) and goats (marg.). It is better therefore to use the ordinary comprehensive term.

[15] Ver. 22. On the precise sense of חָרוּץ, the authorities differ. LXX. γλωσσότμητον=*having the tongue cut;* Targ. Jon.=*having the eyelids torn;* Jerome, *cicatricem habens.* The A. V. has followed the Targ. Onk. in a sense which may be considered as sufficiently general to include all the others.

[16] Ver. 22. יַבֶּלֶת, adj. fem. from יָבַל=*to flow.* It is ἅπ. λεγ., but there seems no doubt of its meaning.

[17] Ver. 23. שֶׂה is neither specifically *a lamb* (A. V.) nor *a kid* (marg.), but may be either. See Textual Note [14] on ver. 21. Gesen.: "a noun of unity corresponding to the collect. צֹאן, a flock, *sc.* of sheep or goats."

[18] Ver. 23. שָׂרוּעַ is an animal which has an inequality between the corresponding parts, as the two legs, or two eyes, so that one of them is longer or larger than it should be; while קָלוּט, on the other hand, signifies one having such part smaller than its normally developed fellow.

[19] Ver. 24 According to all authorities the preceding clause refers to the four ways of castration practised among the ancients (see Aristot. *hist. an.* ix. 37, 3, and the other authorities cited by Knobel and Keil); the latter clause contains, incidentally, an absolute prohibition of such customs in the land, and has nothing to do with sacrifice, there being no word for *offering* in the Heb. Such is the interpretation of Josephus (*Ant.* iv. 8, 40) and of the Jewish authorities generally. So also the LXX., the Targs., and the Vulg. The sense of the A. V., however, is found in the Syr.; and is sustained by Knobel and Lange, who says expressly: "It is particularly to be noticed that castration of animals was not universally forbidden in Israel, only no castrated animals might be offered in sacrifice."

[20] Ver. 25. בֶּן־נֵכָר, a different word from the זָר of ver. 10 and the גֵּר of ver. 18, and probably referring to a foreigner, not even sojourning in the land.

[21] Ver. 28. See Note [17] on ver. 23. אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־בְּנוֹ in masc. form; but Rosenmüller notes that in regard to brute animals, the verbs, as well as the nouns and adjectives, take no note of sex.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The analysis of this chapter given by Keil is a very clear one. "Vers. 1-16. **Reverence for things sanctified.**—The law on this matter was (1) that no priest who had become unclean was to touch or eat them (vers. 2-9), and (2) that no one was to eat of them who was not a member of the priestly family (vers. 10-16). Vers. 17-33. **Acceptable Sacrifices.**" Lange introduces the chapter thus: "The keeping

holy of the sacrifice was to correspond to the keeping holy of the priesthood, since this is indeed at the bottom an expression of keeping the priesthood holy. It was most strongly insisted upon." The centre, however, of the whole Levitical system is rather the sacrifice than the priest, and the priest is for the sake of the sacrifice, as is distinctly brought out in this chapter, rather than the reverse. Certainly the sacrifice was earlier, and the necessity for it more fundamental. The symbolical holiness of the priesthood must therefore be considered as an essential requirement in order to their offering of acceptable sacrifices. Lange thus analyzes the chapter: "*a.* In relation to the conduct of the priest, vers. 3-9. *b.* In relation to the conduct of the laity, vers. 10-16. *c.* In relation to the condition of the sacrificial animals, and especially to the fact that everything defective was excluded, vers. 17-25; but also that every proper offering was to be offered to the Lord in the right way, or to be eaten as a thank-offering, vers. 26-33."

The chapter consists of three Divine communications, all given to Moses, the first (vers. 1-16) to be communicated to Aaron and his sons, prescribing under what conditions the priests are not to touch the offerings (1-9), and who beside the priests might partake of them (10-16); the second (17-25) is to be communicated not only to Aaron, but **unto all the children of Israel**, determining the quality of the victims; while the third (26-33) is to Moses alone, prescribing certain conditions to be observed with all victims, and concluding the chapter.

Vers. 1-9. For his view of the difficult passage in ver. 2, Lange refers to his translation, which runs thus: **that they profane not my holy name—even they, who have it in charge to keep holy for Me,"** thus referring the relative אֲשֶׁר to the name. Other commentators refer it to **the holy things of the children of Israel**, as in the A. V., LXX. and Vulg. (Rosenmüller, Knobel, Kalisch, Murphy, Keil, Clark, *etc.*). The sense of the whole verse is certainly that the priests should not profane the holy gifts of the people by approaching them when themselves in a condition unlawful for priestly ministrations. The expression **separate themselves from the holy things** is clearly to be understood as meaning under the circumstances mentioned below. "הִנָּזַר with מִן, to keep away, separate one's self from anything, *i. e.* not to regard or treat them as on a par with unconsecrated things." Keil. The Divine acceptance of the sacrifices was expressed by the priests' eating certain parts of them as the representatives of God. These were allowed to be eaten by those who were permanently disqualified by physical defects from offering the sacrifices (xxi. 22); but if consumed by those in a state of uncleanness, would be a profanation of the name of the Lord. The prohibition extends not only to the eating, but to the touching them at all. Ver. 3. **Shall be cut off from my presence** is considered by Rosenmüller and others as equivalent to the expression "shall be cut off from the midst of his people." A better interpretation (Knobel, Clark) is that it means: "shall be excluded from the sanctuary"—deprived of his priestly office. Lange, however, interprets it that "the penalty of death is pronounced upon every one of the priestly family who approaches the holy things in a state of uncleanness, whether it be to offer or to eat the priestly sacrificial food." But he afterwards adds: "With the positive death penalty is connected at the same time a mysterious destiny of death, which Jehovah reserves to Himself. The legislation has as yet no idea of the ruder forms of desecration of the sacrifice in the future as *e. g.* 1 Sam. ii. 12 sqq." This was the penalty attached to the violation of any of the precepts in this paragraph. The uncleannesses mentioned in vers. 4-6 have already been treated in their appropriate places. They are only mentioned here as showing that they excluded the priest from contact with holy things. Vers. 6, 7, prescribe for the priest, as for the people in similar cases, the simplest forms of purification, and when these are observed, limit the time of the uncleanness to the going down of the sun. In accordance with the considerate character of the Divine legislation, it then allows him to eat of the sacrifice, **because it is his food.** In ver. 8 the eating of that which had not been properly slain, and was therefore still contaminated with the blood, is forbidden with especial emphasis to the priests whose office was to make atonement with the blood. This had already been forbidden to all the people (xi. 39, 40) with but a slight penalty for transgression. Here the transgression for the priest comes under the heavier sentence of ver. 3. Calvin notes that such a special prohibition was needed lest the priests might think themselves, in virtue of their office, exempt from the laws binding upon the rest of the people. Ver. 9. **Lest they bear sin for it, and die therefore,** gives the penalty in general of a priestly neglect to keep God's **ordinance**, but is not necessarily to be understood of the penalty for the breach of each particular precept mentioned. The command here, as everywhere, is made to rest upon the consideration, **I the LORD do sanctify them.**

Vers. 10-16. This forms the second part of the first Divine communication, and prescribes who beside the priests themselves might or might not eat of the holy things. It has nothing to do with the most holy things which could be eaten only by the priests themselves. "The זָר is the **stranger** relatively; accordingly those who are not Israelites, not Levites, not relatives; here, those who are not priests. He might not eat of the holy food of the offerings, however near he might stand to the priest as a neighbor, or a day laborer; but on the other hand, the purchased slave, since he had become by circumcision an Israelite and one of the household of the priest, might certainly eat of it, together with those born in the priest's house. *And here again the house appears in its full theocratic significance.* (Comp. Com. on Matt., p. 146.) It results from this, that the married daughter of a priest is excluded; she belonged to another house (if it were a priestly house, she might of course eat there with them). Her right revives

again, however, if she comes back to her father's house as a childless widow or divorced; but if she had children, she formed with the children another house. If one who had no right ate of the holy things by mistake, he must make restitution to the priest for what he had eaten, and add a fifth part thereto. "The verse refers only to something unimportant, for in the case of greater things he was commanded, moreover, to offer a trespass offering (ch. v. 15)." Knobel. The difference is in this, that here the subject is the transgression of eating the priestly portion of the heave offering; there, of heedless injury done to the sanctuary in regard to the portion hallowed to Jehovah." [It seems more probable that the case here referred to is exactly included under that in v. 15, 16, and that the trespass offering is not expressly mentioned here because it is only necessary to show that this case comes under the category of those for which the trespass offering was required. Calvin well observes that this prohibition was necessary to prevent the "holy things being regarded as common food."—F. G.] "Here too the law is led back to **I the LORD do sanctify them.** The history of David (1 Sam. xxi.) and the New Testament explanation of it (Matt. xii. 3) show that necessity provided exceptions to this rule. But the rule rests upon the truth that religion must be kept holy, in the strongest sense, even in its sacrifices, otherwise guilt will accumulate upon the people who profess the religion (ver. 16). When deceit is practised against Jehovah in any way, *e. g.* by feigned fasts, by asceticism, joined with secret sins, by fanatic faith joined with a life of plunder, the manliness itself of the natural man is buried more and more, and the intercourse of the people loses more and more of its saving salt of moral truth—not to speak of the refining fire of the spirit of the new birth. —**When they eat their holy things.**—That which as holy things belonged to them no longer." Lange. On the meaning of the last clause see Textual Note 10. The provision in regard to the purchased servant in ver. 11 is of importance as showing how completely such servants became identified with the house of their masters. The command was given only about a year after the Exodus when the tribes of Israel doubtless included a large number of the circumcised descendants of the servants of the patriarchs; but there can be no stronger identification than is here given in allowing the purchased servants of the priests from whatever nation, in contradistinction to a servant hired from any other family in Israel, to eat of the priestly portion of the holy things.

Vers. 17-25. Moses is directed to convey this communication **unto all the children of Israel**, because it was important to have them all entirely familiar with the conditions necessary to an acceptable victim. They were to know all the laws; but their attention would naturally be more fixed upon those which were immediately addressed to them. The law in regard to the victims necessarily applies to all cases, whether they were offered by persons **of the house of Israel, or of the strangers** (ver. 18), because it prescribes what was required in the victim itself in order to its acceptance. The burnt offering is first treated of (vers. 18-20), and then the peace offering. Vow and free-will offerings might be made of either kind of sacrifice; but the regulations concerning the victim differed. If it was a burnt offering, it must be **a male**, as well as **without blemish**, according to the law of the burnt offering in i. 3, 10; if it was a peace offering, there was no law concerning the sex of the victim; but it was still required (ver. 21) **there shall be no blemish therein.** The rigidness of the law was, however, somewhat relaxed in case of the free-will offering (ver. 23), so that for this purpose a victim was allowed to have some **thing superfluous or lacking in his parts.** For the distinction between the vow and the free-will offering, see Com. on vii. 15. The other kind of peace offering, the thank offering, is not mentioned here; being the highest of all, it of course required the perfect victim. Among the Gentiles also a sense of natural fitness generally required that the victim should be *integrus* and *τελείος*. See abundant references in Rosenmüller and Knobel here, in Outram L. I, c. 9, and Bochart *Hieroz.* I. L. II. c. 46. Ver. 24 absolutely prohibits the offering in sacrifice of any castrated animals. See Textual Note. Lange: "The minute, precise definition of this defect requires the perfect fitness for breeding in the male animals, without which it lost in a great degree its signification of a worthy resignation." In ver. 25 the priests are forbidden to accept even from a **stranger's hand** victims marked with any of the defects that have been enumerated, **because their corruption is in them**, *i. e.* because these defects render them unfit for sacrifice. **The bread of your God** "must be derived from a perfect victim to represent that which is acceptable to God, which in moral things is perfect righteousness." Murphy.

Vers. 26-33. The final communication made to Moses alone. Lange: "Even in the case of sacrificial animals without blemish, there yet appear particular conditions of acceptableness for the offerers. First, the victim must be eight days old; it must be kept **seven days under the dam** to enjoy the full pleasure of existence." See the same law in Ex. xxii. 30 in regard to firstlings. "The reason for this was, that the young animal had not attained to a mature and self-sustained life during the first week of its existence." Keil. It is noticeable that the age at which the animal became admissible for sacrifice is the same as that at which man was received into covenant relation by circumcision. At this age, too, the animal first began to be eatable, and this fact doubtless had its significance in the laws for the symbolical food of Jehovah. Similar restrictions of age were in use among the Romans, Pliny *Nat. Hist.* viii. 77. The prohibition in ver. 28 of killing both dam and offspring on the same day is analogous to the thrice repeated precept: "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk" (Ex. xxiii. 19; xxxiv. 26; Deut. xiv. 21), and rests upon the same principle as the prohibition to take from a bird's nest the mother together with the young (Deut. xxii. 6, 7). All these precepts were of an educational character and imposed

upon the Israelites the duty of keeping sacred, even among the lower animals, the relation which God has established between parent and offspring. The law could not have been for the sake of the brute, but was altogether for man's sake; he must not allow himself to violate the finer susceptibilities implanted in his nature, even when mere utilitarian reasoning could see no use in the command. The Targ. Jon. prefaces the command with the words: "As our Father is merciful in heaven, so be ye merciful on earth." The connection here applies the precept especially to killing for sacrifice; but it is noticeable that the word used is the more general שָׁחַט, as if the command was meant to apply to all killing whatever. In ver. 30 the law for eating the thank offering on the same day on which it is presented is repeated from vii. 15. Such repetitions, if not of necessity, are yet at least highly desirable in a lengthened code of laws. The conclusion, vers. 31-33, is like that of chapters xviii. and xix., and rests upon the fact that He who gives the commands is Jehovah—Jehovah who sanctifies them, and who has brought them up **out of the land of Egypt**. Lange: "**I am Jehovah** is said again to seal this command, and the following explanation shows plainly the educational view: that Jehovah seeks to bring them up to be a holy people of God by means of these fixed directions. The educational idea is negative: only certainly no kind of dishonor, or deceit, or faithlessness is allowable in matters of religion."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. "The symbolical and definite thought of the whole chapter has the highest meaning for every form of religion, but particularly for the Christian Church. It seeks a faultless, normal priesthood, a priesthood which does not darken, but glorifies religion, the service of God. When we think of the sad fact that priests have often altogether, or in a great degree, corrupted their religious community, or are now corrupting it, that so many spiritual and hierarchical cripples of every kind darken and disfigure so many congregations, the contents of our section will give us a strong witness against a laxity and untruth which is guilty especially of the corruption of the religious life. The church training was to be before all things self-training, the ladder of the churchly life. How many reflections in regard to the choice of the theological profession, the tests, the ordinations, and the ecclesiastical visitations belong to this chapter. Also the family circumstances of spiritual persons are here estimated according to their significance." Lange.

II. The relation of the priests to the people is here again distinctly brought out. They were under precisely the same laws as others, became unclean from the same causes, and were to be purified in the same way; in short, they were fully citizens of the commonwealth of Israel. But inasmuch as they had also special duties toward God, they were incapacitated for their performance by this uncleanness.

III. The identification of the household with its head, always strongly marked in the Hebrew polity, appears in the case of the priest with especial clearness. The family is the unit of the Hebrew commonwealth and the basis of the Mosaic legislation. On this see Maine's *Ancient Law*.

IV. The law of the conditions of the acceptable victim was precisely the same for the Israelite and the stranger. The law thus intimates not obscurely that in their approach to God all men stand on precisely the same footing. "There is no distinction of persons."

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "Chap. xxii. is concerned with the pure conduct of the priests face to face with the sacrifice of the congregation; observances of cleanness of the most varied kind, and especially of sacrifices according to their spiritual meaning."

As symbolical cleanness was required of those who partook of the sacrifices which typified the death of Christ, so is spiritual cleanness necessary in those who feed upon the memorial of the same. See 1 Cor. xi. 28, *etc.* Wordsworth. The whole house of the priest was sanctified through him to partake of the holy things; so is the whole house of the Great High Priest sanctified through Him, even His body, the blessed company of all faithful people.

But to be partakers of the table of this Great High Priest men must not be merely sojourners in His house, or serving Him as hired servants for gain, but truly identified with Him, and forming an actual part of His household. Wordsworth.

Again and again the law insists that the victim for the acceptable sacrifice must be without blemish. Whatever is offered to God must be of the best; especially must the offering of the heart be perfect and complete. Christ Himself is described as having offered Himself "without spot," and the Church which He presents unto Himself must "be holy and without blemish." Eph. v. 27.

By forbidding the Israelites to kill on the same day the dam and its offspring God taught them, and through them the church in all ages, to be merciful; not only merciful to those who can understand and appreciate it, but to exercise this virtue for its own sake—to be merciful always and everywhere, even as our Father in heaven is merciful.

Calvin draws from the often repeated and here extended precept that the sacrifice must be perfect and without blemish, this lesson: that whatever we offer to God must be whole-hearted and true. We cannot serve God and mammon. He applies this to prayers in which the heart is not engaged, and a multitude of other things in which man may undertake to offer an imperfect and divided, and therefore unacceptable service.

PART THIRD.

Sanctification of the Feasts.

"Keeping holy the theocratic times and places, the feasts and their cultus, the most holy name of the covenant God and His holy land."—LANGE.

CHAPS. XXIII.—XXV.

FIRST SECTION.

Of the Sabbaths and Annual Feasts.

"The Holy Seasons, Laws of the Feasts, Sabbath, Easter, Pentecost, the Seventh New-Moon or Sabbath of the Year, the Day of Atonement and the Feast of Tabernacles."—LANGE.

CHAP. XXIII. 1–44.

PRELIMINARY NOTE.

The following, under Lange's Exegetical, may properly be placed here. "The foundation of these developed ordinances for the feasts has already presented itself in Ex. xx. 8-11 and xxxi. 14" [add Ex. xxiii. 14-19; xxxiv. 21-26, and in regard to the Passover, the full account of its institution, Ex. xii. 3-27, 43-50,—F. G.]; "the section, Num. xxviii. xxix., contains more specific directions about the sacrifices which were to be offered on the feast days." [The three great festivals are also described in Deut. xvi. 1-17, and the reading of the law required at the feast of tabernacles in the Sabbatical year, Deut. xxxi. 10-13.—F. G.]. "Here the treatment is of the organic appearance of the whole festivity of Israel in the unity of its collective holy feasts, with the ordinance of the festal cultus ("Feast-calendar," Knobel says, which is set aside by Keil); in the Book of Numbers the sacrifices are plainly specified as the requirements of the theocratic state, an indication that they were not the principal things in the ideas of the cultus.

"Upon this important section the article *Feste* in Winer and others, is to be compared, as well as the rich literature in Knobel, p. 541, to which add Kranold, *commentatio de anno Hebræorum Jubilæo.* Gottingæ, Dietrich, 1838." [See also PHILO περὶ τῆς Ἐβδόμης; BAEHR, *Symbolik* bk. iv.; EWALD *Alterthümer;* KALISCH *on Ex. xx., etc.;* MICHAELIS *Laws of Moses,* Art. 74–76, 194–201; BOCHART, *Hieroz.;* and the appropriate articles in SMITH'S *Bible Dict.,* KITTO'S *Cyclop. of Bib. lit.,* HERZOG'S *Real-Encykl.,* and the various literature cited in these.—F. G.].

"The Hebrew festivals are to be regarded especially in a two-fold aspect: 1. The holy **seasons** (מוֹעֲדֵי יְהוָה). 2. The ideas of the different feasts, **the holy convocations** (מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ).

"The holy seasons are, according to their prevalent fundamental number, the number seven, collectively, memorial feasts of the creation; the Sabbath, as the seventh day; Pentecost, as the feast of the seventh week; the seventh new moon, with its following Day of atonement and feast of tabernacles, as the feast of the seventh month; the Sabbatical year, as the festival of the seven Sabbath years; and the Praise year or year of Jubilee; the 50th year, as the festival of the completed seven, the seven times seven, the prophetic festival of the new eternal festal season. (ch. xxv.).

"Even through the single feasts the number seven runs again: seven days of unleavened bread, seven days in tabernacles, and no less indeed is it reflected in the sevenfold number of the festal sacrifices.

"The datum, however, from which the whole construction of the festal season proceeds, on which the whole building rests, is the *datum of the typical deliverance of Israel* (ver. 15). The line of feasts culminates indeed in a festival [Tabernacles, the last feast of the year] which plainly, as a symbol of the completed deliverance stands over against the [Passover as a symbol of the] beginning of deliverance." [From another point of view the Passover (which, as such, is not mentioned in this chapter) is generally regarded as a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt in its totality, and in its typical significance it points forward to the deliverance from sin through the death of Christ; and this again has its memorial in the Lord's Supper, pointing forward to the feast of the Lamb in heaven. The feast of tabernacles, on the other hand, was expressly commemorative of the very temporary dwelling in booths (סֻכּוֹת = huts made of branches; the סֻכָּה is to be distinguished from

the אֹהֶל = tent, the comparatively permanent dwelling of the wilderness) see vers. 42, 43, and comp. Ex. xii. 37; xiii. 20.—F. G.]. * * *

"With regard to the natural aspect of the Israelitish feasts, they are divided into pre-Mosaic, Mosaic (for that the feasts here appointed belong to the original Mosaic legislation is admitted by Knobel), and later feasts.

"In the first class, however, can only be placed with certainty a tradition of the Sabbath, the feast of the new moon, and the harvest feast. Upon the heathen festal seasons see the full notes of Knobel, p. 537 sqq.

"It is however in the highest degree noteworthy, that the Israelitish ordering of the feasts forms an unmistakable contrast to the heathen customs. At the time of the Spring feast the Jewish Easter was kept, which, in connection with its unleavened bread, expresses a very solemn meaning, and is not at all to be judged by the Christian Easter. At the time of the autumnal equinox, however, when the Syrians (and the Egyptians) mourned over the death of Adonis the summer sun (like the Germanic *Baldur*), the Jews kept their most joyful feast, and freely used the green branches of summer before they faded." [The contrast would bear to be even more strongly expressed, for the feast of Tabernacles occurred more than a month later than the autumnal equinox.—F. G.]. "It was as if they had wished to celebrate the triumph of the theocratic spirit over the natural sadness for the death of beautiful nature; as they certainly accent the blessing of God and His judgment in this present life in contrast to the dark Egyptian necromancy with its prophecy inspired this side the grave, and in contrast to the melancholy cultus of the world of death beyond the grave.

"As to the explanation of the apparently superfluous days in the seven day feasts, the eighth day of unleavened bread, and the eighth day of the feast of Tabernacles (a question which also concerns the 50th week of the 50th year as a year of Jubilee), it is certainly sufficient to say, that the festal close of such great days or weeks and years was to be particularly emphasized. (Comp. Knobel, p. 549).

"The second Easter day as the feast of the first beginning of the harvest, the beginning of the barley harvest, the feast of the ears (Abib, ear-month), corresponds to the completed wheat harvest which was celebrated at the feast of Tabernacles (later, Pentecost because fifty days were reckoned from Easter to its celebration), and both these harvest feasts, of the necessities of life and of the abundance of life, form a contrast to the harvest feast of joy [feast of Tabernacles] for the refreshing and comforting gifts of God, the fruit, the oil and the wine.

"A strikingly isolated position is given to the feast of Pentecost between the other feasts. Since as the chief harvest feast it seems to be only a natural feast, there was sought, and later, there was also found, in addition to its natural aspect, a holy and theocratic aspect also, in that this feast has been described as the feast of the law (since Maimonides. See on the other hand Keil, p. 151") [Translation p. 444, note]. * * *

"The increased sacrifices of the yearly feasts must form a symbolical expression of the self-surrender of the nation to Jehovah, renewed by the feasts, as it was elevated by the thanksgiving for His gifts,—the ever new gifts of creation, the ever new gifts of atonement and of deliverance.

"That which makes feasts to be feasts is as follows: 1) They are high seasons appointed by God, seasons of the fulfilment of Divine promise and of human hope. 2) Seasons in which the union of God and man, as well as of men with one another, and thus fellowship with God and brotherhood with man was celebrated. 3) Seasons in which nature, together with man, appears in the dress of theocratic sanctification. 4) In which the highest happiness of human fellowship arises from the highest joyfulness of sacrifice to Jehovah. 5) Seasons which have a great sequence, and form a chain from the feast of deliverance in the night of judgment and of fear (Passover) to the feast of holy freedom and joy (Tabernacles)." Lange.

In regard to the times of the festivals, it is to be remembered that God in His dealings with man always shows a tender regard for the nature with which He has constituted man. The Hebrew festivals were therefore so arranged as to combine the most important religious memorials and types with the occasions of national and social need. The Passover was the greatest of all the annual festivals of the Hebrews, and was the only one resting upon a distinct historical and miraculous event, and the only one, too, the neglect of which was accompanied with the penalty of excision (Num. ix. 13). The obligation to observe it was so urgent upon every adult circumcised Israelite, that alone of all the feasts it had attached to it a second observance at the same time in the following month for those who were prevented from keeping it by absence on a journey, or by defilement from contact with a dead body—the only causes which interfered with the eating of the paschal lamb. Historically, it was far more generally observed than either of the other festivals. Attached to this, and often included in the general name of Passover, was the week of unleavened bread; but the strictness of the command for the observance of the Passover itself did not apply to this. See Deut. xvi. 7. The Passover was celebrated in the month Abib or Nisan; and this month, as the month of the great national deliverance from Egypt, became the first of the ecclesiastical year. Just at this time occurred the beginning of the barley harvest, and the festival for this was accordingly so associated with the Passover, that a sheaf of the first-fruits was to be waved before the Lord on the morrow after the Sabbath. The time of the feast of weeks, or Pentecost, was determined by the Passover, from which it was distant just fifty-two days, as we still reckon from Good-Friday to Whitsunday; for seven weeks complete, or forty-nine days were reckoned from "the morrow after the Sabbath," or the second day after the eating of the Paschal lamb itself, making fifty-one days, and then the feast was to be held on the following day. The symbolism of the sevens is therefore to be sought rather in the means of computing the time than in the relation of the festivals to one another. Pentecost occurred at the close of the grain harvest, and

was celebrated as a thanksgiving, with especial liberality to the poor and needy in remembrance that the Israelites themselves had been bondmen in Egypt. (Deut. xvi. 9–12). This feast continued but a single day, and its distinguishing rite was the waving before the Lord of two *leavened* loaves prepared from the first fruits of the wheat.

With the coming in of the seventh month the civil year began. Of the existence of this year as distinguished from the ecclesiastical year, there can be no reasonable doubt. It has indeed been called in question; "but the form of expression in Ex. xii. 2, the commencement of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years in the month Ethanim, or Tisri, the tradition of both the rabbinical and Alexandrian Jews, and the fact that the new moon festival of Tisri is the only one—not excepting that of Nisan—which is distinguished by peculiar observance, seem to bear sufficient testimony to a more ancient computation of time than that instituted by Moses in connection with the Passover. Another argument is furnished by Ex. xxiii. 16." Clark. Accordingly, as generally in all times and among all nations, the New Year was ushered in by a special observance. Among the Hebrews this took the form of "the Feast of Trumpets." This was marked by "an holy convocation;" but attendance upon it was not obligatory. On the tenth day of the same month occurred the solemn fast of the Day of Atonement already treated in ch. xvi. Both these continued but a single day. On the fifteenth day of the same month (which was thus far more marked by religious solemnities than any other), began the Feast of Tabernacles, continuing for seven days with "an holy convocation" following on the eighth day. The attendance obligatory at this would naturally have led to a large presence of the people on the Day of Atonement, only five days before. It was the great harvest festival at the close of the agricultural season, corresponding to our Thanksgiving day, and was very joyfully celebrated. It was also connected with the theocratic system by the injunction to dwell in booths in memory of the Exodus from Egypt.

With all these, and pervading them, was the weekly Sabbath, a remembrancer in its recurrence of God's rest from the work of creation (Ex. xx. 11), and in its determination to the seventh day of the week of the deliverance from Egypt (Deut. v. 15).

In regard to the detail of these several festivals, see the Exegetical.

The Jews were prohibited by the law from all work only on the fifty-two weekly Sabbaths and on the Day of Atonement; they were also prohibited from all servile work on the days of holy convocation, *viz.* two each in connection with the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles, one at the Feast of Pentecost, and one at the New Moon of Tisri, the seventh month. There is no prescription in the law in regard to cessation of work on the other New Moons; but from Amos viii. 5 they appear to have been, at least in later times, observed as Sabbaths. These would make in all seventy days, which would be reduced somewhat by the occurrence of some of the other days, and especially of the festival Sabbaths, one year with another, upon the weekly Sabbath; but on several of these days the prohibition extended only to servile work, and the feasts were probably largely used like European fairs, for purposes of trade. See a slightly different computation in Michaelis, *Laws*, Art. 201.

The three greater festivals, Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles, were required to be observed by the assembling of the whole adult male population at the place of the sanctuary. This was doubtless fully carried out during the life in the wilderness, but does not appear to have been ever completely observed in subsequent history. All these festivals were, however, attended by large numbers, and the devouter part of the people went up to the sanctuary at least once in the year (1 Sam. i. 3, 21; Luke ii. 41, *etc.*), which appears to have been most commonly at the Passover. The women were not obliged, but were allowed to attend, and frequently did so, as well as partake of the Paschal lamb.

Besides these annual feasts, there were the Sabbatical years, when the land was required to lie fallow, and all fruits were common property. This command could hardly have been complied with at all until after the return from the captivity (see 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21), and the existence of such an unobserved law is a strong proof of the genuineness of the Mosaic legislation. There was also the Year of Jubilee, the fiftieth year, which as it affected the tenure of land that had been sold, is likely to have been more continuously observed. It certainly was recognized in the days of Jeremiah (Jer. xxxii. 6–15). On the question whether it had continued to be observed in the intervening time, see Maimonides and Ewald in the affirmative, Michaelis (*Laws*, Art. 76) and Winer (*sub voce*), who are in doubt, and Kranold (p. 80) and Hupfeld (pt. iii., p. 20), who confidently deny that the provisions for this year ever came into actual operation.

Precisely what was meant by **an holy convocation** we have no means of ascertaining, except from the word itself. Doubtless in the wilderness life it would have meant a general assembling of the people for the purposes of the day, and the same sense may be held to apply to the three great festivals when all males were required to appear at the place of the sanctuary, but this cannot be true, after the settlement in Canaan, of the weekly Sabbath and of the Day of Atonement. Probably there were on these days gatherings for religious edification accompanied with rest from work in the various towns and villages throughout the land, just as there were in the Synagogues after the return from the Captivity. There were also probably such gatherings at the time of the Convocations of the greater festivals of those who did not go up to the Sanctuary.

Besides the weekly Sabbaths, there were in all seven Convocations in the year: the first and last days of the feasts of unleavened bread, and of Tabernacles, the days of Pentecost and of Atonement, and the Feast of Trumpets.

Chapter XXIII. 1–44.

1, 2 And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, *Concerning* the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim *to be* holy convocations, *even* these *are* my feasts [unto them, The appointed times of the Lord which ye shall proclaim *as* holy convocations, these are my appointed times[1]].

3 Six days shall work be done: but the seventh day *is* the sabbath of rest,[2] an holy convocation; ye shall do no work *therein:* it *is* the sabbath of the Lord in all your dwellings.

4 These[3] *are* the feasts of the Lord, *even* [These appointed times[1] of the Lord *are*] holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their seasons [appointed times[1]].

5, 6 In the fourteenth *day*[4] of the first month at even *is* the Lord's passover. And on the fifteenth day of the same month *is* the feast of unleavened bread unto the
7 Lord: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread. In the first day ye shall have
8 an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile[5] work therein. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord seven days: in the seventh day *is* an holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work *therein.*

9, 10 And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf[6] of the firstfruits of your
11 harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the sheaf before the Lord, to be ac-
12 cepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And ye shall offer that day when ye wave the sheaf an he lamb [a ram[7]] without blemish
13 of the first year for a burnt offering unto the Lord. And the meat offering [oblation[8]] thereof *shall be* two tenth deals of fine flour mingled with oil, an offering made by fire unto the Lord *for* a sweet savour: and the[9] drink offering thereof

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. The word מוֹעֵד according to all authorities means primarily *a fixed, appointed time* (Gen. xxi. 2; Jer. viii. 7, *etc.*) and it is so translated in ver. 4 *in their seasons.* Thence it came to be used for the festivals occurring at set times (Zech. viii. 19). Besides these meanings the word has the divided signification of the assembly which came together at these times, and then the assembly or congregation generally (whence the expression Tabernacle of congregation), and then also the place of the assembly. The derivative significations are here out of the question. It occurs in this chapter five times, and is not elsewhere used in Lev. except in the phrase *Tabernacle of congregation.* With the same exception, it is uniformly translated *time* or *season* (set or appointed) in Gen. and Ex., and generally in Num. The translation four times by *feasts* in this chap. is therefore exceptional and supported only by a few instances in Num. It is better therefore to conform the translation here to the usage. There is a difficulty with either translation in the fact that **a holy convocation** was not proclaimed on the Day of Atonement;—that is broadly applied to all, which was strictly true of nearly all the particulars mentioned. But *feasts* labors under the further disadvantage that the Day of atonement was a fast.

[2] Ver. 3. The translation necessarily fails to convey the full force of the Heb. שַׁבַּת שַׁבָּתוֹן a very strong expression used only of the days and years of rest appointed in the Mosaic legislation.

[3] Ver. 4. The Heb. has אֵלֶּה, the Sam. prefixes וְ. According to Houbigant the former refers to what has preceded, the latter to what follows. In this case the Sam. reading is preferable.

[4] Ver. 5. The missing יוֹם is supplied in 15 MSS. and the Sam.

[5] Ver. 7. "מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה, occupation of a work, signifies labor at some definite occupation, *e. g.*, the building of the tabernacle, Ex. xxxv. 24; xxxvi. 1, 3; hence occupation in connection with trade or one's social calling, such as agriculture, handicraft, *etc.*; whilst מְלָאכָה is the performance of any kind of work, *e. g.*, kindling fire for cooking food (Ex. xxxv. 2, 3)." Keil.

[6] Ver. 10. עֹמֶר. The A. V. is probably right in translating here *sheaf*, which according to the lexicographers is the primary meaning of the word. See Deut. xxiv. 19; Ruth ii. 7, 15, *etc.* It is so translated by the LXX., Vulg., and Luther, as well as by Gesen., Fürst, Lee, and others. On the other hand Josephus (Ant. iii. 10, 5), and the Mishna, take it in its derived and more usual sense of an *Omer, viz.*, of the flour from the grain, offered with oil and frankincense as an oblation. Perhaps in later times the omer of the flour was substituted for the original sheaf of the grain.

[7] Ver. 12. כֶּבֶשׂ. See Textual Note [5] on iii. 7. Here the sex is indicated.

[8] Ver. 13. מִנְחָתוֹ. See Textual Note [2] on ii. 1. The pronoun is masc. with reference to the sex of the sacrifice.

[9] Ver. 13. The A. V. here and in the previous clause substitutes the def. art. for the masc. pronoun. The Heb. text נִסְכָּהּ is pointed in accordance with the *K'ri* נִסְכּוֹ which is also the Sam. reading.

14 *shall be* of wine, the fourth *part* of an hin. And ye shall eat neither bread, nor
parched corn [grain], nor green ears, until the selfsame day that ye have brought
an offering unto your God: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your genera-
tions in all your dwellings.
15 And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day
that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering; seven sabbaths[10] shall be complete:
16 even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath[10] shall ye number fifty days; and
17 ye shall offer a new meat offering [oblation[8]] unto the LORD. Ye shall bring out
of your habitations two wave loaves[11] of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour;
18 they shall be baken with leaven; *they are* the firstfruits unto the LORD. And ye
shall offer with the bread seven lambs [rams[7]] without blemish of the first year,
and one young bullock, and two [full-grown[12]] rams: they shall be *for* a burnt of-
fering unto the LORD, with their meat offering [oblation[8]], and their drink offer-
19 ings, *even* an offering made by fire, of sweet savour unto the LORD. Then ye shall
sacrifice one kid [buck[13]] of the goats for a sin offering, and two lambs [rams[7]] of
20 the first year for a sacrifice of peace offerings. And the priest shall wave them
with the bread of the firstfruits *for* a wave offering before the LORD, with the two
21 lambs [rams[7]]: they shall be holy to the LORD for the priest. And ye shall pro-
claim on the selfsame day, *that* it may be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall
do no servile work *therein: it shall be* a statute for ever in all your dwellings
throughout your generations.
22 And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make clean riddance
of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any glean-
ing of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger: I *am*
the LORD your God.
23, 24 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel,
saying, In the seventh month, in the first *day* of the month, shall ye have a sab-
bath [a sabbath rest[14]], a memorial of blowing of trumpets,[15] an holy convocation.
25 Ye shall do no servile work *therein:* but ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto
the LORD.
26, 27 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Also on the tenth *day* of this seventh
month *there shall be* [only the tenth of this seventh month is[16]] a day of atonement:
it shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall afflict your souls, and offer
28 an offering made by fire unto the LORD. And ye shall do no work in that same
day: for it *is* a day of atonement, to make an atonement for you before the LORD
29 your God. For whatsoever soul *it be* that shall not be afflicted in that same day,
30 he shall be cut off from among his people. And whatsoever soul *it be* that doeth
any work in that same day, the same soul will I destroy from among his people.
31 Ye shall do no manner of work: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your ge-

[10] Ver. 15. Some critics (Keil, Clark, and others) would render here and in xxv. 8 *seven weeks*, in accordance with the use of שַׁבָּת in the Talmud, and of *σάββατον* in the N. T. The word seems to be used here, however, rather by a figure of speech as in xxv. 2, 4, *etc.*, and the definite meaning of *week* to be of later origin. The תְּמִימֹת on which Keil relies, agrees with the main idea.

[11] Ver. 17. The Sam. here supplies the word חַלּוֹת which is uniformly translated *cakes* in the A. V., and may indicate the kind of bread used.

[12] Ver. 18 אֵילִם indicates strong and full-grown rams of maturer age than the כְּבָשִׂים of the first clause. The Sam. 3 MSS. and LXX. add "without blemish."

[13] Ver. 19. שְׂעִיר־עִזִּים. See Textual Note [21] on iv. 23.

[14] Ver. 24. שַׁבָּתוֹן here stands by itself without the שַׁבָּת used in ver. 3. When thus used by itself Rosenmüller says "de iis tantum feriis dicitur, quæ non in septimum hebdomadis diem, qui שַׁבָּת, *cessatio* ab opere *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* dicitur, incidit." It should therefore be rendered by another term, and the one suggested by Clark is adopted.

[15] Ver. 24. There is nothing in the Heb. corresponding to the words *of trumpets*, which should therefore be in italics. The Heb. reads simply זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה = *a memorial of a joyful noise.* תְּרוּעָה is frequently used in connection with various kinds of trumpets and other instruments (Num. xxxi. 6; Lev. xxv. 9; Ps. cl. 5), denoting the clangor of those instruments, but it is also quite as frequently used without reference to an instrument of any kind (Num. xxiii. 21; Job viii. 21; xxxiii. 26; Ezra iii. 11, 13, *etc.*). The silver trumpets of the temple were however blown on all the festivals, including the new moons (Num. x. 10), and there is no reason to question the tradition that on "the feast of trumpets" horns or cornets of some kind were blown generally throughout the land. The LXX. has *μνημόσυνον σαλπίγγων*, the Vulg. *memoriale clangentibus tubis.*

[16] Ver. 27. אַךְ is a particle of limitation, and thus in this case of emphasis. It is better to omit the italicised words *there shall be*, and translate according to the usual construction of a Heb. clause ending with הוּא.

32 nerations in all your dwellings. It *shall be* unto you a sabbath of rest,[2] and ye shall
afflict your souls; in the ninth *day* of the month at even,[17] from even unto even,
shall ye celebrate your sabbath [your rest[18]].
33, 34 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel,
saying, The fifteenth day of this seventh month *shall be* the feast of tabernacles *for*
35 seven days unto the LORD. On the first day *shall be* an holy convocation: ye shall
36 do no servile work *therein*. Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto
the LORD: on the eighth day shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall
offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD: it *is* a solemn assembly,[19] *and* ye
shall do no servile work *therein*.
37 These *are* the feasts [appointed times[1]] of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim *to*
be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt of-
fering, and a meat offering [an oblation[3]], a sacrifice, and drink offerings, every
38 thing upon his day: beside the sabbaths of the LORD, and beside your gifts, and
beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which ye give unto the
LORD.
39 Also [Only[16]] in the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when ye have gathered
[at your gathering in[20]] in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the LORD
seven days: on the first day *shall be* a sabbath, and on the eighth day *shall be* a
40 sabbath. And ye shall take you on the first day the boughs [fruit[21]] of goodly
trees,[22] branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees,[23] and willows of the
41 brook; and ye shall rejoice before the LORD your God seven days. And ye shall
keep it a feast unto the LORD seven days in the year. *It shall be* a statute for ever
42 in your generations: ye shall celebrate it in the seventh month. Ye shall dwell in
43 booths seven days; all that are Israelites born shall dwell in booths: that your
generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when
I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God.
44 And Moses declared unto the children of Israel the feasts [appointed times[1]] of
the LORD.

[17] Ver. 32. The word בְּעֶרֶב = *at even* is omitted in one MS., LXX., and Vulg.

[18] Ver. 32. The margin of the A. V. is more correct than the text. The Heb. is תִּשְׁבְּתוּ שַׁבַּתְּכֶם.

[19] Ver. 36. עֲצֶרֶת is a word the signification of which has been much questioned. The translation of the LXX. ἐξόδιόν ἐστι, meaning *the close* of the festival, is defended by Fürst, and adopted by Patrick; so also Theodoret, referring not only to this feast, but to the whole cycle of feasts, τὸ τέλος τῶν ἑορτῶν, and so also Keil. Michaelis, using an Arabic etymology, interprets it of *pressing out* the grapes. The sense of the margin of the A. V. *day of restraint* is said to be advocated by Iken in a special dissertation (Con. Ikenii *Dissertatt.* Ludg. Batav. 1749) and is adopted by Abarbanel and other Jewish writers. The text of the A. V. *assembly* is defended by Rosenmüller (3d Ed.), advocated by Gesenius, and is that given by Onkelos, the Vulg., and Syr. The LXX. also elsewhere translates the word πανήγυρις (Amos. v. 2) and σύνοδος (Jer. ix. 2). The word occurs but ten times, in five of which it refers to the last day of one of the great feasts, and in one other (Jer. ix. 2 [1]) it clearly means assembly. Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 10, 6) applies it as a customary phrase to the feast of Pentecost. It is the day referred to in Jno. vii. 37 as "the last day, that great day of the feast."

[20] Ver. 39. בְּאָסְפְּכֶם. It is better to preserve the indefiniteness of the original which does not determine whether the harvest was already fully gathered. Clark thinks that this could rarely have been the case.

[21] Ver. 40. The Heb., as noted in the margin of the A. V., is *fruit*, and it is better to retain the word even if it be explained (Keil) of "the shoots and branches of the trees." According to the most ancient traditions, however, it was customary at this feast to carry in one hand some fruit, and the word is retained in all the ancient versions.

[22] Ver. 40. עֵץ הָדָר, lit. *ornamental trees*, a generic word including the various kinds specified just below. So the Sam., LXX., Syr., and Vulg., the lexicons, and most interpreters. Jewish tradition, however, incorporated into the Targums and Josephus (*Ant.* xiii. 13, 5) understands it specifically of the *Citron*.

[23] Ver. 40. עֲנַף־עֵבֹת. The rendering of the A. V. is sustained by almost all authorities, meaning trees of various kinds having thick foliage. The Targums all interpret it specifically of *myrtles*, which cannot be right, as in the account of the celebration of this feast in Neh. viii. 15 the *myrtle* and the *thick trees* are distinguished.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This chapter consists of five Divine communications to Moses, beginning respectively with vers. 1, 9, 23, 26 and 33, all of which, except that concerning the day of Atonement, ver. 26, he is directed to **speak unto the children of Israel.** The first of these (1–8) relates to the weekly Sabbath, the Passover, and the following feast of unleavened bread; the second (9–22) to the wave sheaf in connection with the last feast, and the feast of weeks, or Pentecost; the third (23–25) to the civil New Year, or the New Moon of the seventh month of the ecclesiastical year; the fourth (26–32) to the great Day of Atonement; the last (33–44) to the feast of tabernacles.

Ver. 2 forms the heading or introduction to the whole chapter. This is a full list of all those days and years, all **the appointed times** which the Lord had marked out as to be separated and distinguished from the ordinary course of the daily life; yet it does not include the

ordinary new moons on which special sacrifices were also to be offered. Num. xxviii. 11-15.

Ver. 3. First of all comes the weekly Sabbath, a day to be observed by a total cessation from all work and by **an holy invocation.** On the last expression see the close of the preliminary note. The weekly Sabbath is placed in the same way before the annual appointed times in Ex. xxiii. 12-17; Num. xxviii. 9—xxix. No reason is here given for this observance. It was certainly pre-Mosaic, and in the fourth commandment is made to rest upon the example of the Divine cessation from the works of creation. But this refers only to the observance of rest in a proportionate part of the time—one day in every seven, and therefore has no bearing upon the actual length of the creative work. In the repetition of the commandments in Deut. v., the observance of this rest on the particular day of the week, Saturday, is grounded on the deliverance from Egypt, that great mark of the Divine favor and national birth-day which enters more or less into nearly all the feasts.

A great part of Lange's Exegetical under this chapter has been already given in the preliminary note. All that follows what is given there will be found below.

"1. **The Sabbath.**—The six days of work are the foundation and the condition of the rest of the seventh day. The prohibition not only of servile labor (עֲבֹדָה), but also of the higher and freer business (מְלָאכָה), forces the nobler sort of men directly to look in upon themselves, to devotion, and so to celebrate the feast. The *Sabbath Sabbathon* (the Sabbath feast) has, however, been here already appointed for the assembling in the Sanctuary, a thing which was possible in the desert journeys, and later in Canaan, was fulfilled by the substitution of the synagogues (see Winer, *Synagogen*), and thus was the germ of all festivals." Lange. On the interval of nearly a thousand years between the desert journeys and the institution of Synagogues, see preliminary note.

The weekly Sabbaths are in a sense included among **the appointed times** of ver. 2, but yet are distinguished from them by the fresh heading of ver. 4 and by vers. 37, 38. They were indeed **appointed times**, but appointed from the creation of man, not first prescribed by the Mosaic law. The expression at the close of the verse **in all your dwellings** is interpreted by the Jewish writers to mean *everywhere, in or out of the Holy Land.* Certainly it is thus comprehensive; but the expression is more important as distinguishing the convocation of these days from those of the annual festivals. These were to be celebrated at home, in each town and village and hamlet, and thus "kept alive the knowledge and piety of the simple yeoman in all the land. . . . . This single verse affords an interesting prospect of the unwritten history of Israel's rural piety." Murphy.

Vers. 4-8. Ver. 4 is simply the heading in substance of ver. 2 repeated to distinguish the annual from the weekly festival. Vers. 5-8 relate to the Passover and the feast of unleavened bread, which are here, as in Ex. xii. and Num. xxviii. 16, 17, clearly distinguished from each other. The same distinction is observed by Josephus (*Ant.* III. 10, 5), but both names came to be used interchangeably as in the New Test., especially in St. John. Of all the annual festivals the Passover came first in the cycle of the ecclesiastical year, first in the great historic event it commemorated, first in its obligation, and first in its spiritual and typical significance. The Paschal lamb was to be slain on the 14th Nisan "between the evenings," and eaten in the following evening, *i. e.* according to the Hebrew division of the days, on the beginning of the 15th. But with the 15th began the first day of holy convocation, so that the two feasts were thus actually blended into one. Lange: "2. **The feast of unleavened bread.**—With this begin the feasts in the more peculiar sense, which were *proclaimed*, and in Canaan are also feasts of **convocation** of Israel at the sanctuary (for the male youth and men). . . . . The 15th day is particularly the feast of *Mazzoth*, which lasts seven days, but in such wise that only the first and last day are in the more strict sense festival days which exclude all business. To these two feasts was appended in a certain sense as a third the preliminary feast of the harvest. It speaks for the antiquity of the text that this feast was postponed to the future. Not until they came into Palestine could Israel gather in harvests and offer sheaves of the first fruits. The first sheaf cut from the first field produce is meant, *viz.* barley (on the barley harvest in Palestine, see Keil, p. 148)." [Trans., p. 439. Keil refers to Philo and Josephus for the statement that the sheaf was of barley, and says this is not expressly mentioned because it was a matter of course. "In the warmer parts of Palestine the barley ripens about the middle of April, and is reaped in April or the beginning of May, whereas the wheat ripens two or three weeks later (Seetzen; Robinson's *Pal.* ii. 263, 278)." F. G.] "The sheaf was to be waved before Jehovah. Does this mean: hallowed indeed to Jehovah, but given to the priest? So it seems from ver. 20. But according to Ex. xxix. 24, 27, that which was waved was in part brought to the altar and in part designated as for Moses [*i. e.* for Aaron and his sons]. So the sanctification to Jehovah was to be the principal idea of the waving, but certainly with the secondary idea that it was only ideally offered to Jehovah for the use of the priest. The first day of the *Mazzoth* was reckoned as a Sabbath, and the sheaf of the first fruits was presented on the second of the seven days. That day was distinguished by a festal sacrifice. But the sacrifice is small, for the year is yet poor—of less value than the later sacrifices: one lamb for the burnt offering, **two tenths** (of an Ephah) of wheat flour moistened with oil for the oblation, to which was added **the fourth part of an hin** for a drink offering. Under this condition only was Israel acceptable in its preliminary feast of the harvest, and the prohibition is a very prominent thing: before Jehovah has received His sheaf of the first fruits nothing of the new bread can be eaten. A law for posterity! says the legislation in the wilderness." [The

first Divine communication of this chapter closes with ver. 8. It contains the command for the observance of the Sabbath, of the Passover, and the general direction for the observance of the feast of unleavened bread. Here it ends, and a new communication begins with ver. 9, and extends to ver. 22 containing the commands for the wave sheaf, which was a part of the feast of unleavened bread, and for the feast of Pentecost. The reason for this apparent dislocation of the logical arrangement is obvious: what was directed in the first communication was to be immediately observed during the wilderness life, while the wave sheaf and Pentecost could not be, and were not intended to be observed until the entrance upon the land of Canaan. There is here therefore an incidental, but very strong evidence of the date of this legislation. At any other time than during the wilderness-life, all the precepts for the feast of unleavened bread would certainly have been arranged in the same paragraph. Ver. 11. **On the morrow after the Sabbath.**—Various opinions have been held in regard to this Sabbath. According to the Bœthoseans (see Lightfoot on Luke vi. 1) the beginning of the ecclesiastical year was so arranged that the Passover always fell on the Sabbath, and consequently "the morrow after the Sabbath" and the feast of Pentecost were always observed on the first day of the week. This opinion has been adopted by several modern authorities, as Hitzig, Hupfeld, Knobel, Kurtz The two former of these think that the sheaf was waved after the conclusion of the feast on the 22d of the month; the two latter, on the 15th, the first day of holy convocation. It has been confuted by Bähr and Weiseler, and is rejected by Keil and Clark on the ground that such an arrangement would involve a broken or partial week almost invariably at the close of the year, which is of course inadmissible. It may be added further that the *first* day and the *seventh* day of the feast could not possibly have both fallen upon the weekly Sabbath, and that the provision for both is the same (vers. 7, 8) forbidding only *servile* work. Another opinion is that the Sabbath was that weekly Sabbath which must occur on one of the days of the feast. This was the view of the Sadducees and of the Karaite Jews, but while it rests upon no positive support, seems sufficiently refuted by the argument of Keil (note, p. 440) that "if the Sabbath was not fixed, but might fall upon any day of the seven days' feast of Mazzoth, and therefore as much as five or six days after the Passover, the feast of Passover itself would be forced out of the fundamental position which it occupied in the series of annual festivals (comp. Ranke, *Pentateuch* II. 108)." The better view is that found in the LXX., Philo, Josephus, the Targums, and the Rabbinical writers generally, and which seems most in accordance with the text itself, that the Sabbath was simply the festival Sabbath, the 15th Abib, on whatever day of the week it might happen to fall. So Lange below. The sheaf of first fruits was then waved on the 16th, and from that day the time was reckoned to the feast of Pentecost. "By offering the sheaf of first fruits of the harvest, the Israelites were to consecrate their daily bread to the Lord their God, and practically to acknowledge that they owed the blessing of the harvest to the grace of God." Keil. The offerings of vers. 12, 13, were especially connected with the wave sheaf, and were additional to the regular feast day sacrifices prescribed in Num. xxviii. 19-24. The oblation was doubled (see Ex. xxix. 40; Num. xv. 4; xxviii. 21) as was appropriate to a harvest festival; but the drink offering (which in Leviticus is mentioned only here and in vers. 18, 37) remained as usual. Ver. 14. **Bread . . . . parched grain . . . . green ears** are the three forms in which grain was commonly eaten, and the expression is equivalent to forbidding its use in any form whatever before the waving of the sheaf of first-fruits.—F. G.].

"3. The Feast of Weeks. . [Vers. 15-22]. Determination of the time: From the second day of the Mazzoth seven Sabbaths were counted, *i. e.*, forty-nine days. The following day, the fiftieth, is the feast of weeks (חַג שָׁבֻעוֹת). The leading thought is the new oblation which was brought to Jehovah from the completed grain harvest. It was to be brought out of all dwellings, and thus not out of the regular temple revenues: **two wave loaves** of two-tenths (of an Ephah) of fine wheaten flour. The baked bread must be leavened, which shows that leaven does not, in and of itself, signify the evil (comp. Comm. on Matt. p. 197) [xi. 33, Am. Ed., p. 245]. This was the first-fruits of the whole grain harvest which must be hallowed to Jehovah before the bread from the new harvest might be eaten." [This is not stated in the Text, and while it was undoubtedly true in regard to the wheat, must not be understood to include also the barley which it became lawful to use immediately after the offering of the wave sheaf during the feast of unleavened bread.—F. G.]. "The year has now become richer, and hence seven lambs must be offered for a burnt offering besides a young ox (bullock) and two rams, and with all these the proportionate drink offerings. Besides these there was a he-goat for the sin offering—hardly with reference to the unleavened bread (according to Keil, p. 151), but certainly with reference to the sins which were wont to accompany the harvesting." [The precise remark of Keil, (trans. p. 443) is as follows: "The sin offering was to excite the feeling and consciousness of sin on the part of the congregation of Israel, that whilst eating their daily leavened bread they might not serve the leaven of their old nature, but seek and implore from the Lord their God the forgiveness and cleansing away of their sin." It is to be observed that this sin offering was neither that required for a definite sin of the whole congregation, a bullock (iv. 14), nor yet that for an individual, a she-goat (*ib.* 28), but was the same as that required for a prince (*ib.* 23). The reason for it is to be sought, not in any especial and definite sin, but in that general and continual sinfulness which the chosen people were commanded to recognize on all occasions of especial solemnity.—F. G.]. "Finally two lambs as a peace offering, or thank offering, closed the feast. These peace offerings were waved with the loaves of first-fruits, *i. e.*, were

sanctified to Jehovah, and then fell to the priest. A principal direction for even *this day* is that it was proclaimed as **a convocation** of the sanctuary, and that on it even domestic work itself was forbidden as well as servile labor." [The text however (ver. 21) contains only the prohibition of **servile work.** It is noticeable that this Pentecostal offering of two young rams was the only peace offering required of the whole congregation in the Mosaic ritual.—F. G.]. "With this memorable religious command is connected the humane one, that the reaper of the harvest must let some remain in the borders of the field, and that gleaning was forbidden in favor of the poor (comp. Ruth). It is plainly said again with this command: **I am the Lord your God.**" [This feast was not to be observed until **ye be come into the land which I give unto you,** and Theodoret (Qu. 32 *in Lev.*), says that it then "renewed the memory of the entrance into the land of promise." Since Maimonides (see Lange above) it has been customary to connect it with the giving of the law. Neither of these associations, however, rest on any sure foundation. In Ex. xxxiv. 22 this festival is more particularly described, as indeed is implied here, as the first-fruits of the *wheat* harvest. The loaves differed from all ordinary oblations in being leavened, as an offering from the people's daily bread to the Lord who had blessed the harvest (comp. ii. 11, 12), but in accordance with the general law, they were not to be placed upon the altar. "The injunction **out of your habitations** is not to be understood, as Calvin and others suppose [so also Corn. a Lapide, and Lange above], as signifying that every householder was to present two such loaves; it simply expresses the idea, that they were to be loaves made for the daily food of a household, and not prepared expressly for holy purposes." Keil. A moment's reflection upon the immense mass of bread that would be required from the 600,000 men of Israel, to be eaten only by the priests and their families, is sufficient to show that Keil's explanation must be right. The victims to be offered, according to vers. 18, 19, differ from those prescribed in Num. xxviii. 28-31 for the same occasion in two particulars: there is no mention there of the peace offerings required here (ver. 19), but this is merely a difference in the particularity of the command which frequently occurs; and there *two* young bullocks and *one* ram are required, while here it is *one* of the former and *two* of the latter, the offerings in all other respects being the same. On this account many commentators have supposed that the offerings in Num. were simply a festival enlargement of the daily burnt offering, while those here commanded were additional sacrifices accompanying the special rites of the festival. It can hardly, however, be considered a rash conjecture that in one place or the other the numerals may have changed places in the hands of the scribes. Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 10, 5) follows the statement in Num. Vers. 19, 20. The sin and peace offerings were to be *waved.* According to Jewish tradition this was accomplished by leading the animals backwards and forwards according to an established custom. With the waving of the sin offering comp. the waving of the leper's trespass offering, xiv. 12. The flesh of both these offerings, unlike the ordinary peace offerings, was to belong to the priest. Ver. 21. **On the selfsame day.** The feast of weeks is distinguished from the two other great festivals in lasting but a single day; but it is said to have been the custom in later times to give a festal character to the six days following, and to continue to offer abundant sacrifices upon them. The feast is only described here as **an holy convocation,** and is called *the feast of harvest* in Ex. xxiii. 16, *the feast of weeks, of the first-fruits of wheat harvest,* Ex. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10, *day of the first-fruits* Num. xxviii. 26. The name *Pentecost* belongs to a later time, and appears in the Apocrypha (Tobit ii. 1; 2 Macc. xii. 32), and in the N. Test. (Acts ii. 1; xx. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 8). By Jewish writers it is frequently called עֲצֶרֶת (see Text. Note 19 on ver. 36), Gr. Ἀσαρθά. As in nature the ripening of the later grain was connected with that of the earlier, so in the law the time of the festival for the one was made dependent upon that of the other; just as when the type was absorbed in the Antitype the descent of the Holy Ghost was dependent upon the Resurrection of Christ, the First-fruits from the dead on the morrow after the Sabbath of the Passover; and the commemoration festival of Whitsunday has ever been observed by the Christian Church in dependence upon Easter. In ver. 22 the command already given in xix. 9, 10, is appropriately repeated in connection with the harvest feast, and this is again reiterated in Deut. xxiv. 19 in connection with precepts of kindness to the needy.

Vers. 23–25. Here begins a fresh Divine communication (the third of this chapter) because the present feast was, like those of the first, to come into immediate use. Lange: "4. The feast of Trombones, or the new-moon feast of the seventh day of the first month." [This is apparently a slip of the pen for the first day of the seventh month.—F. G.]. "The lesser new moon feasts are not mentioned here: they belong more to the ordinary life of the people and to the State (hence Num. xxviii. 11). Also the seventh new moon is here only very briefly mentioned, and significantly described as *Sabbathon Zikron,* as a feast Sabbath which was to be a Sabbath of memorial. The festal remembrance, however, had respect to the new holy season which dawned with the seventh month. Thus as the first feasts—Easter, Mazzoth, and First-fruits—form a trilogy, so the great new moon feast makes also a trilogy with the following Day of Atonement and Feast of Tabernacles. It is a feast of joyous sounds (תְּרוּעָה) to awaken a national festal disposition by means of a festival blowing, not however with 'trumpets' which were not ordered till Num. x., and with their clear piercing tone were fitted for the march of the army of God; but with the deep droning of horns, trombones, which like bells, rather affect deeply than arouse." There is nothing said in the text of any instrument, see Textual Note 15 on ver. 24: but as the silver trumpets were to be blown on all the new moons, and on all other festal occasions (Num. x. 10), they must have been blown also on this new moon, whatever

other instruments may have been used besides. "In the modern service of the Synagogue, Ps. lxxxi. is used at the feast of Trumpets." Clark. The general view of the Rabbinists is said to have been that it was a commemoration of the creation when "all the sons of God shouted for joy," Job xxxviii. 7. Other commemorations, equally fanciful, have been proposed, but it is unnecessary to look beyond the fact that it was New Year's day. This being a feast when it was not required that all the people should appear at the Sanctuary, the "holy convocation" was probably observed, like the weekly Sabbath, in each town and village throughout the land. Nevertheless a special burnt offering (ver. 25) was to be offered at the Sanctuary, and this is specified in Num. xxix. 1–6, as consisting of a bullock, a ram, and seven lambs, with their oblations and drink offerings.

Vers. 26–32. A new communication is made in regard to the Day of Atonement, not for the reasons given before, but to mark the importance of the day. This subject has been so fully treated in ch. xvi. that little need be said here. It was on this day and not on the first of the month that the year of Jubilee was to be proclaimed (xxv. 9). On this day also the people were not required to assemble at the Sanctuary, and the **holy convocation** must have been kept at their homes. Lange: "5. The Day of Atonement. It is a noticeable anomaly that it falls upon the tenth day. Ten is the number of the closed history, the reckoning up of the double five, the well-used or badly-used freedom, the number of judgment. The Day of Atonement forms the climax as a day of purification, ch. xvi.; here it is an introduction, a preliminary condition for the great feast of Tabernacles (this relation is shown by the אַךְ ver. 27." ["By the restrictive אַךְ, the observance of the day of atonement is represented *a priori* as a peculiar one. The אַךְ refers less to **the tenth day**, than to the leading directions respecting this feast." Keil]. Num. xxix. 7 supplies still a third meaning, as a social or political fast day. It was named the day of expiation (הַכִּפֻּרִים). **Ye shall afflict your souls**; Luther translates arbitrarily: 'Ye shall afflict your body, mortify your body, mortify your bodies.' Certainly from the expression of the original text, the fast is meant in Isa. lviii. 3, *etc.* In order that the neglect might be visible and could be punished, and that the limits might be fixed, it is said: **from even unto even**. For this feast also, as well as the former one, every business (not only labor) was forbidden." [This cannot be meant of the new moon of the seventh month, on which only *servile work* (ver. 25) was forbidden.—F. G.]. "The great rigor is to be noticed with which the penalty of death was threatened for every transgression against the rest of the Sabbath and against the fast."

Vers. 33–36. The ordinance for the feast of Tabernacles is given in a separate communication since this was not to be observed until the entrance into the land of Canaan. Lange: "6. The feast of Tabernacles (חַג הַסֻּכּוֹת). The feast is made prominent by being celebrated upon the 15th and not on the 14th day." [Just as the feast of unleavened bread began on the 15th of the first month.—F. G.]. "And moreover, by being completed by an eighth day (עֲצֶרֶת), the closing festal assembly, see Jno. vii. 37." [There is here also an analogy to the feast of unleavened bread, the seven days of which were preceded by the day of the Passover. In strictness the eighth day was not a part of the feast which, in vers. 34 and 40, is declared to be of **seven days**, and in Deut. xvi. 13-15, and Ez. xlv. 25, there is no mention at all of the eighth day; and it is also distinguished from the days of the feast proper by the much smaller number of the victims to be offered in sacrifice, Num. xxix. 36. Moreover on this day among the Hebrews the booths were dismantled and the people returned to their houses.—F. G.]. "The first and eighth days are holy Sabbaths which exclude every kind of work." [The text, however, vers. 35, 36, only forbids **servile work**.—F. G.]. "But everything else which distinguishes the feasts of the Lord, burnt offerings, oblations, *etc.*, (vers. 37, 38) distinguish this feast abundantly." [These offerings are specified in Num. xxix. 12-38. They consisted of a he-goat for a sin offering and a burnt offering on each day. The latter included two rams and fourteen lambs on each of the days, with a varying number of bullocks. Beginning with thirteen on the first day, they were diminished by one on each successive day, until on the seventh only seven were offered. The burnt offering of the eighth day was only one bullock, one ram, and seven lambs. In all seventy-one bullocks were wholly consumed upon the altar, together with fifteen rams and one hundred and five lambs.—F. G.]. "It is also again a double feast: in the first place the feast of the garnered harvest, the third harvest, which includes both the former ones, and especially hallows to the Lord the noblest produce of the land: the inspiriting fruits, for the children (fruit), for the old (wine), and for the priests (oil)." [The fruit, the oil, and the wine, were however all alike used by all classes in the community.—F. G.]. "And then, in the second place, it was the feast of the memorial of the booths in which Israel had dwelt in the wilderness. The sojourn in the wilderness must have been a hardship during a great part of the year, and they usually dwelt in tents; but then came the Spring and Summer time, when they could build booths, and such a time would be particularly festive, a picture of a paradisaical life of nature. And it is plain that here the subject must be neither the lasting sufferings of the wilderness nor the settlement in Canaan. Hence also the tents must be made from **goodly trees**." [The feast of Tabernacles did not itself occur in the Spring or Summer, but late in the fall, a month or more after the autumnal equinox. No evidence is adduced to show that the Israelites in the wilderness at any time lived otherwise than in tents, and indeed during a large part of their wanderings the construction of booths would have been impossible from the scarcity of trees. The reference to the booths (*succoth*) seems to be rather to the first encampments of the Exodus (comp. Ex. xii. 37; xiii. 20), when they must have been as yet very imperfectly supplied with tents.—F. G.]. "So the feast of ta-

bernacles was the highest feast in Israel (a bright contrast to the feast of Purim introduced afterwards, which was darkened by fanaticism), and was a type of the highest and most beautiful Christian popular feasts. Upon the single feast comp. the Lexicons, also Keil (p. 153 [Trans. p. 446]), and Knobel (p. 549). That this feast could readily bring in peculiar temptations is shown by the story of the adulteress, Jno. viii." [This inference must depend upon the decision that the passage referred to is a genuine part of the Gospel, and is found in its proper place. It is also further to be noticed that the women of Israel were not required to dwell in the booths. —F. G.]. "But we may see also partially from Jno. vii., how it had been in the course of time endowed with the richest symbolism, as a preacher-feast, as a fountain-feast, as a feast of lights, the culmination of the Old Testament festival seasons." [It is noticeable that this feast was the time chosen by Solomon for the dedication of the temple, 1 Kings viii. 2.—F. G.].

"Upon the observance of the line of feasts in the sabbatical year and year of Jubilee, see ch. xxv. On the later Jewish feasts, see *Bibl. Wörterbuch für das Christl. Volk* under the article *Feste.* So too the feasts of the later Jews in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie.*" For additional matter concerning this feast, see under verses 39–42.

In vers. 37, 38, is a summary distinctly specifying that these appointed times, with their offerings, are additional to the weekly Sabbaths mentioned in ver. 3, and their offerings. **Beside the Sabbaths** is comprehensive, including both the day and the sacrifice offered upon it. It means beside them in regard to the other appointed days, and beside their offerings as regards the offerings belonging to these.

Vers. 39–43 contain additional directions for the feast of Tabernacles. Nothing has been said in the previous verses of the dwelling in booths, as the object there was only to treat of it as an appointed time with its days of holy convocation. Here, however, this is introduced by itself, as a necessary direction, yet so as not to disturb the singleness of view in which the whole cycle of feasts has been presented. There is no occasion, therefore, to suppose that this is a distinct document subsequently added. As this precept has reference simply to the dwelling in booths, there is no repetition of the command for the holy convocations, or for the sacrifices, and no mention of the eighth day, on which they returned to their houses. It was pre-eminently a joyous festival (ver. 40), as comported with its character as a harvest feast. On the Sabbatical year at this time the law was to be publicly read in the hearing of all the people of all classes, including the "strangers," Deut. xxxi. 9-13; Neh. viii. 18.

In later times two significant customs were added to the daily observances of the feast. At the time of the morning sacrifice on each day a priest drew water from the pool of Siloam in a golden pitcher and bringing it in to the altar poured it out with the libation of wine. This probably suggested the words of our Lord in Jno. vii. 37, 38. Also in the evening the men and women assembled together in the court of the women to rejoice over the ceremony of the morning, the occasion being marked by great hilarity. At this time two tall stands were set up in the court, each bearing four lamps of large size, the wicks being made of the cast off garments of the priests, and the oil supplied by the sons of the priests. Many of the people also carried flambeaux, and the light is said to have been cast over nearly the whole city. This ceremony seems to have called forth our Lord's words in Jno. viii. 12, "I am the Light of the world." During both these ceremonies the choirs of Levites chanted appropriate psalms, and the people participated by carrying in their hands green branches and fruit. There is a curious contrast between the cycle of annual festivals in the Jewish and in the Christian Church; in both of them the festivals extend through about six months, but in the former, in which earthly blessings are everywhere prominent, it began with the 14th Nisan, and extended through the summer; in the latter, in which the thought is more directed to spiritual blessings, it begins with the early winter and extends round to the summer.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The weekly Sabbath is the beginning and foundation of all the festivals, for herein God is acknowledged as the Creator of all things and of man. By that the people were joined to God, and so made ready for keeping the other festivals of His appointment. This was fixed for the older church upon the seventh day, in memorial of their deliverance from Egypt, the era of their national existence; just as for the Christian Church it is fixed upon the first day in memorial of Christ's resurrection, on which rests the whole existence and constitution of that Church.

II. By the offering of the first-fruits to God the whole harvest was sanctified, comp. Rom. xi. 16. Until this had been done, no Israelite might partake of the harvest at all. God's gifts are freely bestowed upon men; but they may not lawfully appropriate them to their own use until they have acknowledged the Giver.

III. In the three harvest festivals the dominion of God over nature is emphatically asserted. It is asserted in opposition alike to that Pantheism which underlay so much of the ancient heathen mythology, and which would worship the earth itself as the giver of its fruits, while here the homage is rendered to the Lord of the earth as distinct from and infinitely exalted above the earth; and it is asserted in opposition to Deism, which would so separate the Deity from His works as to make them in a sense independent of Him, while here He is recognized as their immediate Ruler and the Author of every earthly blessing.

IV. Leaven, which is for the most part forbidden in oblations, and altogether prohibited from coming upon the altar, is here commanded for the wave offering of the first-fruits of the wheat harvest, very plainly for the express object of teaching that the ordinary food of the people is to be sanctified by an offering to God, and thus in all things He is first of all to be recognized.

V. The peculiarity of a peace offering from the whole congregation marks the Pentecostal feast alone. At the beginning of the wheat harvest, the principal harvest of human food, it was peculiarly appropriate that it should be marked by the sacrifice of communion with God.

VI. In connection with the feast of the harvest comes again into prominence the care for the poor in the prohibition of gleaning. God leaves the poor always with us that man may learn through them to imitate Himself in giving freely to those who need out of the abundance He has given to us.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "The feasts of the Lord and the festal ordinances (ch. xxiii.). Their double basis: 1) the work, 2) the Sabbath. The Sabbath is the end of the trouble of labor, as Sunday is the beginning of festal work. The Old Testament feasts in the light of the New Testament. The Jewish Passover is a double feast; a type of Christmas and of Easter. The Jewish and the Christian Pentecostal feast. The Jewish feast of Atonement and the Christian Ascension-Day (comp. Heb. ix. 24). The Jewish feast of Tabernacles and the Christian harvest feast. The threefold Jewish harvest feast, Easter, Pentecost and Tabernacles, a threefold type of the Divine blessing in the kingdom of nature, and in the kingdom of grace (the first-fruits, the daily bread, the festival wine). The great Day of Atonement, as a day of repentance, and as a day of the Gospel. Comparison between the Day of Atonement and Good-Friday, between Christmas and the feast of Tabernacles. How all feasts by their historical significance are linked with one another, and by their spiritual significance play into one another. The feast is made gay with green boughs."

As the Sabbath is made the foundation of all festivals, so must the sanctification of the weekly day of rest ever be the condition of all acceptable consecration of "appointed times" to the Lord. The days on which no work at all might be done are only the weekly Sabbaths and the Day of Atonement; but the additional days on which no *servile work* might be done were nearly half as many more. These last therefore were days of rest to the slave and the hired laborer. The law would have days when the hard labor of life must cease without suspending its activity altogether, and gives its most numerous days of rest to those who must be employed in life's drudgery.

The rejoicing before the Lord which is here, ver. 40, and in Deut. xvi. 11 commanded with especial reference to the feasts of Tabernacles and of Pentecost, is elsewhere made into a more general duty, Deut. xii. 12, 18; xxvii. 7. If joy was a commanded duty under the Old Dispensation, how much more under the Christian. See Phil. iv. 4, *etc.*

The three great festivals were occasions of gathering all the males of Israel together, and promoting the sense of their common brotherhood. The effect in this regard of united worship is very plain. But especially at the feast of Tabernacles, all were required to dwell in booths, and for the time distinctions of rank and social position were levelled. Thus, as everywhere under the Old Dispensation, principles of the Gospel were taught by symbolical acts, and the brotherhood of all the people of God presented in sensible type and act.

SECOND SECTION.

Of the Holy Lamps, and the Shew Bread.

CHAPTER XXIV. 1–9.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Command the children of Israel, that they bring unto thee pure oil olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamps to burn
3 continually. Without the vail of the testimony, in the tabernacle of the [*omit* the] congregation, shall Aaron[1] order it from the evening unto the morning before the
4 LORD continually: *it shall be* a statute for ever in your generations. He shall order the lamps upon the pure candlestick before the LORD continually.
5 And thou shalt take fine flour, and bake twelve cakes thereof: two tenth deals
6 shall be in one cake. And thou shalt set them in two rows [piles[2]], six on a row
7 [pile[2]], upon the pure table before the LORD. And thou shalt put pure frankincense[3] upon *each* row [pile[2]], that it may be on[4] the bread for a memorial, *even* an

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 3. The Sam. and LXX. here insert *and his sons* from Ex. xxvii. 21.

[2] Vers. 6, 7. The Heb. מַעֲרֶכֶת, referring etymologically to an orderly arrangement, means either *a row* or *a pile*, and is used in both senses. The size of the loaves, however, containing each about six pounds and a quarter of flour, as compared with the size of the table, two cubits long by one broad, makes it more probable that *pile* was intended here. Josephus (*Ant.* III. 6, 6; 10, 7) expressly says, that this was the arrangement.

8 offering made by fire unto the LORD. Every sabbath he shall set it in order before the
LORD continually, *being taken* from the children of Israel by an everlasting covenant.
9 And it shall be Aaron's and his sons'; and they shall eat it[5] in the holy place:
for it *is* most holy unto him of the offerings of the LORD made by fire by a perpetual statute.

[3] Ver. 7. The LXX. adds *and salt*, which is probably to be understood in accordance with ii. 13, or the salt may have been used in making up the loaves.

[4] Ver. 7. לִלְחֹם. The force of the preposition is questioned. Both the senses *on* and *for* are true in themselves. The incense was placed *upon* the piles, according to Josephus (*ubi sup.*) in golden cups, and it was also burned *for* the bread as a memorial. The latter sense, however, is sufficiently expressed by the words **for a memorial.**

[5] Ver. 9. The pronoun, wanting in the Heb., is supplied in the Sam. and in 8 MSS.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The commands for the holy lights and the shewbread here follow in a special communication, to complete the provisions for the typical holiness of the Hebrew cultus. The former has already been given, almost verbatim in Ex. xxvii. 20, 21, prospectively in connection with the provisions for the whole service of the sanctuary. Now the command is actually given, and in Num. viii. 3 its fulfilment is recorded. The phraseology of ver. 2, **Command the children of Israel that they bring**, with that in ver. 8, **taken from the children of Israel**, shows that both the oil and the flour for the shewbread were of the nature of oblations, gifts to the Lord from the people continually. Vers. 2-4 relate to the oil and the lamps; vers. 5-9 to the shewbread.

Ver. 2. **Pure oil olive beaten—pure** in being freed before the berries were crushed from all leaves, twigs, dust, *etc.;* and **beaten** in contradistinction to pressed in the oil-presses. By this beating the oil of the best quality flowed out nearly colorless. **Continually**, ver. 3, refers to the perpetuity of the ordinance, not to the uninterrupted burning of the lamps; for according to the previous part of the verse, Aaron was to **order it from the evening unto the morning**, and according to Ex. xxx. 7, 8, he was to dress the lamps in the morning and to light them at even. The **pure candlestick** of ver. 4, like the **pure table** of ver. 6, refers to the pure gold with which they were made, and which was of course kept free from all stain.

Vers. 5–9. **Fine flour** always means of wheat. The **frankincense**, as a gift from the people, must necessarily be the natural gum, and is to be distinguished from the compound incense which was burnt daily upon the altar of incense. Lange (see below) is inclined to admit the opinion of Knobel that the loaves of shewbread were leavened; Josephus, however (*Ant.* III. 6, 6; 10, 7), distinctly asserts the contrary and nearly all Jewish and other authorities agree with him. "Since the bread was brought into the Holy place (which was not the case with the Pentecostal bread) it almost certainly came under the general law of the meat offerings, which excluded the use of leaven (ii. 11)." Clark. It may be added that the shewbread was changed only once a week, and leavened bread, exposed to the air, could hardly have been kept in condition for eating so long. The loaves were twelve in accordance with the number of the tribes of Israel. They were **most holy**, so that when removed from the table they might be eaten only by the priests in a holy place. The action of Abimelech therefore in giving them to David (1 Sam. xxi. 4-6) was a clear violation of the law, and is justified by our Lord (Matt. xii. 4) on the principle that there are cases of urgency which override the technical provisions of the statute.

Lange: "The holy candlestick, with the shewbread, here makes the tabernacle the inner centre of all consecrations, the holy place κατ' ἐξοχήν, which moves forth and spreads far into the holy land; and the innermost principle of this centre is the name of Jehovah which comes to be spoken farther on.

"On the holy candlestick see the particular directions, Ex. xxv. 30; xxxvii. 17, and Num. viii. 2; comp. Zech. iv. 2. But it is mentioned here the second time, not because according to the first command only Aaron was fitted for the function; but because it here forms the soul of the cultus, as farther on, in Num., it becomes the very climax of the theocratic political life, the light of the nation. Even less here than before can one speak of the lamp of good works. There is a strange propensity to place human attributes in place of Divine in the very house of God, even as far as to the Cherubim in the holy of holies.* The candlestick is the seven-fold figure of the revelation of Jehovah, the type of the Seven Spirits, Rev. i. But it must be noticed that the congregation had to furnish the anointing oil" [Salböl, *i. e.*, the oil for this sacred use, not the oil for anointing the priests, —F. G.], "for the congregation was to be the substratum of all illuminations, not the priesthood alone. In like manner is the command significant that the lamps were to be lit forever and ever.

"The shewbread is called 'bread of the presence,' 'of my presence' (Ex. xxv. 30) in that they lay before the presence of Jehovah, who, in a symbolical sense, here holds a meal with His priests (see Rev. iii. 20) as they in the first place represent the twelve tribes of the holy people. On this account, then, the loaves were twelve, and since they were arranged in two ordered rows of six opposite six loaves (differing from the twelve precious stones of the breastplate) they were called also the loaves of the ranging together, the table of the succession and similarly. Keil, p. 158." [Trans. p. 452. Keil

* Keil: "This service consisted in the fact, that in the oil of the lamps of the seven branched candlestick, which burned before Jehovah, the nation of Israel manifested itself as a congregation which caused its light to shine in the darkness of this world; and that in the shewbread it offered the fruits of its labor in the field of the kingdom of God, as a spiritual sacrifice to Jehovah." [Trans. p. 451].

thinks that the loaves were placed in rows, but does not mention these names. On the arrangement, see Textual Note 2 on ver. 6.—F. G.].

"And since it is known that leaven in itself contains nothing evil, although like honey it might not be placed upon the altar, the supposition of Knobel (Keil to the contrary) has nothing hazardous, that the shewbread was leavened. Undoubtedly it is to be considered that among the later Jews they were unleavened; but against this must be weighed the fact that they formed an important constituent of the food of the officiating priests who ate them as a most holy thing, after they were carried out, and that these loaves were never actually offered, but only hallowed to Jehovah, while their offering was signified by the incense which went with them as a memorial (ver. 7, *Azkara*). The view that the incense was not strewed upon the bread, but placed beside it in golden shells, is certainly strengthened by the purpose of incense, which was burned as an offering made by fire unto Jehovah. It is the sacrifice of prayer which is especially associated with the priestly communion, a "Grace" said before the Lord in the highest sense.

"The supposition of Knobel and others that the table, with shewbread and kindred things, represented the house of God as an imitation of a human house, is a flat travesty of the holy house into that which is common; it rests upon a misunderstanding of the religious symbolism of the house of God, and in it the sleeping chamber, *e. g.*, the bed, and similar things must be missed." [To define the exact boundaries between anthropomorphic language and representations on the one hand, and pure statements of truth and pure symbolism on the other, is extremely difficult, and will probably always remain impossible, while man is still compelled to use so much of anthropomorphic terms even in the most abstract and philosophical discussion of Divine things. Undoubtedly the Hebrew mind was gradually led up to the conception of Divine realities by the exaltation of human expressions, and hence occur such forms as "the food," "the table," "the house of the Lord;" in grosser minds these would have been associated with grosser ideas, while for those of higher spiritual elevation, there was just enough of symbolism in these terms to enable them, by their means, to rise above them to more spiritual and exalted conceptions. To this it was essential that the human imagery should be imperfect and wanting in many particulars.—F. G.].

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The symbolism of the seven-branched candlestick is applied in the Apocalypse to the Holy Spirit. Meantime in its perpetual burning during the night there is also the subordinate teaching that from the worship of God all darkness and obscurity are to be banished by the influence of that Spirit. To this the people are themselves to contribute by bringing the purest oil for the feeding of the lamps. The Holy Spirit ever works upon man through that which is in man, and man may receive the Divine Guest in his heart, or may grieve Him and quench His holy influence.

II. In the shewbread, as the culmination of all oblations, is expressed on the one hand the consecration to God of all that belongs to man by placing bread, the staff of human life, continually before His presence; and on the other, the condescension of God to communion with man in making these loaves the food of His priests. The incense, burned as a memorial, represented the Divine acceptance of the gift, and, as Lange has suggested, symbolized the prayer with which the priests must draw near to this communion. It is further to be noted that this was not the sacred incense of the sanctuary, but the frankincense of the people's offering. As the loaves represented the twelve tribes, so this frankincense represented the people's prayers; and in this symbolic act of communion, the priests on God's behalf pratook of the food, as in the case of the sin offering.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "The proper maintenance for the candlestick in the house of God. The table of the Lord in the Old Testament and in the New Testament forms. The Lord at His table: 1) as the Bread of heaven; 2) as the Host; 3) as the Guest."

In the worship of God light and clearness are ever to take the place of darkness and obscurity. The clear shining of the Holy Spirit's direction is always to be sought in all approach to God, and to this end the pure oil is to be furnished by the people for the lamps; an honest and good heart is to be prepared for the Spirit's dwelling.

Through the grace of God man becomes a partaker of the table of the Lord. This must be accompanied with the incense of prayer. It was to be a statute for ever, a perpetually recurring act of communion with God.

Origen: The light of the Jews grew dim as the oil of their piety failed; the foolish virgins were excluded from the marriage when their lamps were gone out for the want of oil; so Christians must furnish the oil of earnest effort after holiness, that the flame of the Spirit may burn in their hearts, so that men may see their good works, and that their lamps may be burning when the Master comes.

THIRD SECTION.

Historical.—The Punishment of a Blasphemer.

"*The keeping holy of the Theocratic Religion, and of the Name of Jehovah, by means of an explicit example.*"—Vers. 10–16.

"*The keeping holy of punishment, and of the distinction of punishment, whose culmination is stoning.*" Vers. 17–23.—LANGE.

CHAPTER XXIV. 10–23.

10 AND the son of an Israelitish woman, whose father *was* an Egyptian, went out
among the children of Israel: and this son of the Israelitish *woman* and a man of
11 Israel strove together in the camp; and the Israelitish woman's son blasphemed[1]
the name *of the* LORD [*omit of the* LORD[2]], and cursed. And they brought him
unto Moses: (and his mother's name *was* Shelomith, the daughter of Dibri, of the
12 tribe of Dan:) and they put him in ward, that the mind of the LORD might be
shewed them.
13, 14 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Bring forth him that hath cursed
without the camp; and let all that heard *him* lay their hands upon his head, and
15 let all the congregation stone him. And thou shalt speak unto the children of
16 Israel, saying, Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he that blas-
phemeth the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death, *and* all the con-
gregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger as he that is born in the
land, when he blasphemeth[1] the name *of the* LORD [*omit of the* LORD[2]] shall be
put to death.
17, 18 And he that killeth[3] any man shall surely be put to death. And he that kill-
19 eth[3] a beast shall make it good; beast[3] for beast.[3] And if a man cause a blemish
20 in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach,
eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be
21 done to him *again*. And he that killeth[3] a beast, he shall restore it: and he that
22 killeth[3] a man, he shall be put to death. Ye[4] shall have one manner of law, as
well for the stranger as for one of your own country: for I *am* the LORD your God.
23 And Moses spake to the children of Israel, that they should bring forth him that
had cursed out of the camp, and stone him with stones. And the children of Israel
did as the LORD commanded Moses.

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Vers. 11, 16. נָקַב according to all the best critical authorities, means *to revile, to blaspheme;* the LXX. and Targums, however, interpret it as meaning *to utter distinctly*, thus embodying the Jewish tradition of the unlawfulness of uttering the name of Jehovah. See the Exeg.

[2] Vers. 11, 16. The words in italics are better omitted, allowing the sense to stand exactly as in the Heb. and all the Ancient Versions, where **the Name** evidently means the Name κατ ἐξοχήν, the name of Jehovah. In ver. 16 the article is omitted in the Heb., but supplied in the Sam.

[3] Vers. 17, 18, 21. The Heb. here uses the word נֶפֶשׁ very freely, as is in part indicated in the marginal readings of the A. V. Translating נֶפֶשׁ *soul*, vers. 17, 18 will read literally, And he that smiteth the soul of any man shall die the death, and he that smiteth the soul of a beast shall make it good; soul for soul. Similarly in ver. 21. A few MSS. omit the נֶפֶשׁ before beast in vers. 18 and 21.

[4] Ver. 22. The Sam. has the sing. Seven MSS. of that version, however, follow the plural form of the Heb.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The whole of Lange's Exegetical is here given. "According to Knobel the foregoing section stands disconnectedly in this place. But certainly in this place ought to stand the principle of all consecrations, the name of Jehovah, and it fits in with the high importance of keeping this Name holy that the law, in its genesis, should be introduced with a fearful example. Similarly the history of the Sabbath-breaker is introduced.

Num. xv. 32." [Of course the immediate reason for the introduction of the narrative is that the event actually occurred just at this point in the communication of this legislation to the people, and it thus constitutes one of the strong incidental marks of the time when that legislation was given. Lange shows that its mention was the very reverse of inopportune. It is noticeable that the patronymic *Israelite* is found elsewhere only in 2 Sam. xvii. 25; and the adjective *Israelitish* occurs only here. It is used in opposition to *Egyptian* as the two terms are likely to have been used at the time in the camp. So in 2 Sam. xvii. 25 it is used of a man of the ten tribes in opposition to the two. —F. G.].

"The son of an Israelitish woman and an Egyptian man went out into the midst of the Israelites, *i. e.*, he betook himself to the camp of the latter. He belonged to the strangers who journeyed with Israel (Ex. xii. 38). As an Egyptian, he dwelt certainly somewhat removed, since he was not a member of the congregation of Jehovah; for only in the third generation was an Egyptian to be taken in (Deut. xxiii. 8)." [Although this law had not yet been announced, Lange's supposition is altogether probable, and the man doubtless formed one of the "mixed multitude" who lived on the outskirts of the camp, comp. Num. xi. 1, 4.—F. G.]. "The Israelites encamped according to the houses of their tribes" (Num. ii. 2). In the camp a strife arose; "a quarrel sprang up between him and the Israelitish man, that is, between him and the men of Israel" (Knobel). Against the very appropriate view that אִישׁ stands collectively, see the grammatical note of Keil, p. 158.

"The history certainly tells us how the Egyptian offended in an ascending scale, even up to the blaspheming Jehovah. The text, ver. 10, shows that the Egyptian man had come in with a certain degree of impudence into the midst of the camp of Israel, where he did not belong. From this it is also to be concluded that he excited here a religious quarrel, and it could only have been with one, as the issue proves." [In the entire absence of reliable knowledge of the cause of this quarrel the tradition embodied in the Targs. of Jerus. and Jon. may be noted. According to these the Egyptian was the son of an Egyptian who had slain an Israelite in the land of Egypt and then had gone in to his wife. She had borne the child among the Israelites, being herself of the tribe of Dan. In the desert this man claimed the right to pitch his tent with the tribe of Dan, and the right being resisted by a man of that tribe, they took the case before the judge, where it was decided against the Egyptian. On coming out under this adverse judgment, he committed his offense.—F. G.]. "Thus his insolence rose to blaspheming "THE NAME." This expression: the Name, absolutely, raises the name of Jehovah above all names, and blasphemy against it was not only blasphemy against the God of Israel, but also against the religion of His revelation, against the covenant with Jehovah, and thus against the holy Source of all consecrations. So he was led before Moses. That he was **put in ward** shows that the measure of punishment for this unheard of transgression had not yet been made clear. And it had not been settled for the reason that he did not belong to the commonwealth of Israel in the stricter sense. Hence the punishment was made known to Moses by an especial revelation from Jehovah. The greatness of the crime is shown by the following particulars:

"1. The punishment of stoning was to be solemnly performed by the whole congregation, because the blasphemy rested, like a curse, upon the whole congregation.

"2. All who had heard the blasphemy must lay their hands on the head of the criminal before the execution. Until this expiation they are contaminated with a complicity in guilt (see ch. v. 1), which they must discharge from themselves upon the guilty head." [Keil refers to the washing of hands in Deut. xxi. 6 as analogous. Knobel, however, considers that the command is connected with Deut. xvii. 7, requiring the witnesses to throw the first stones. They were in either case thus to make themselves responsible for the truth of the accusation.—F. G.].

"3. The greatness of the guilt is in the first place to be compared with the lesser guilt of a man's cursing his God, *i. e.*, his *Elohim* in His peculiar relation to him, wherein he might mean, *e. g.* that this *Elohim* had done him wrong. This קלל may have very different degrees, even to speaking evil; therefore he **shall bear his sin**: in the first place, his evil conscience; then his sentence according to the judgment of the theocratic tribunal." [As this particular offender was an Egyptian, and as the law (ver. 16) includes **the stranger** generally, many commentators have understood the expression **his God** to mean the Deity whom he is accustomed to worship. In confirmation of this it is urged that penalty for him that **curseth his God** in ver. 15 is only that he **shall bear his sin**; while in ver. 16 **he that blasphemeth** (or reviletb, a feebler expression than curseth) **the name of the LORD, he shall surely be put to death.** For the last reason, others have maintained that אֱלֹהִים does not here signify God at all, but human magistrates. The reason, however, is of little weight. In ver. 15 is given the general law with the indefinite penalty; in ver. 16 it is repeated for the sake of emphasis, with definiteness in regard to every particular, the sin, the punishment, the executioners, and the application of the law to the stranger as well as the native. The reference of ver. 15 to the gods of the strangers is peculiarly unfortunate. It cannot be imagined that the law of Jehovah should thus provide for the honor of those false gods whom it aims to bring into contempt.—F. G.].

"4. This punishment of stoning should apply to the stranger as well as to the Israelite, because in the first place, he entered the congregation of Israel as a blasphemer of its name; and in the second place, proved thereby that he did not do it unconsciously, but had an idea of the signification of this name.

"5. If then the object of the ordinances for punishment next following was that the penal law of the Israelites should also apply to the stranger who sojourned in their community;

yet the immediately following degrees of punishment form a scale which gives one a clear idea of the greatness of the blasphemer's crime against Majesty. The death penalty for the murderer forms a basis. Behind this follow the various degrees, severe according to the law of compensation (Ex. xxi. 23), but yet the blasphemer stands pre-eminent, far above the murderer. The principal reason for this arrangement lies indeed in this: that the capital punishment of the Egyptian might easily excite a fanatical contempt and misusage of the stranger; therefore it is here most fittingly made prominent that the Jews [Israelites] and strangers, stand under the same law, and that the murdering of the stranger must also be punished with death. With the elevation and hallowing of the punishment here appointed above all partisan fanaticism, it became self-evident that the same punishment must fall upon the Jews [Israelites]. How proper is it that the name of Jehovah should be again inserted for the purpose that the stranger might have equal administration of justice with the Jew [Israelite]. Manifold misunderstanding has attached itself to this legislation. The Jewish misinterpretation of נָקַב (in the sense of *to name*, instead of *to revile*, *to blaspheme*) has had for its consequence the Jewish superstition that man may not pronounce the name of Jehovah, and the after effect no less that in the LXX. the name κύριος is in the place of Jehovah, and also the placing of the name Lord in the German Bible" [and in the English, but here distinguished by small capital letters—F. G.], "also indirectly that the name Jehovah is now translated with the Jews: the Eternal.

"The Mediæval misinterpretation drew over into the New Testament time the penal justice touching it, and the reflection thereof still shows itself in the history of the Church of Geneva. The mention of the mother of the blasphemer, Shelomith (the peaceable), daughter of Dibri (my word), of the tribe of Dan appears to be only a mark of definite remembrance. A community which suffers the reviling of the principle of their community without reaction, is morally fallen to pieces. This holds good also of the religious community. The reaction of the theocracy could not and should not transplant itself into the Church; but since it was outstripped by the middle ages, there has come in more recent time, over against this extreme, a fearful relaxation, which misses the dynamic reaction against the impudent and the blasphemers of the principle of the community."

This chapter is founded upon the fact that among the Hebrews the child followed the condition of the father and not of the mother. It is probably only one of a multitude of instances of children born in Egypt of parentage of different nations, and many of the "mixed multitude" who followed the Israelites may have had Israelitish mothers. The doubt arising as to the punishment of a blasphemer who was not one of the covenant people, led to Moses' asking for Divine direction. In answer, not only this particular case is settled, but the Hebrew law generally is made applicable to the sojourner. In connection with the penalty for killing cattle is announced in express terms (vers. 18, 21), that which had only been implied before (Ex. xxi. 33-36). The law for the punishment of blasphemy in ver. 16 is perfectly clear; it was from a wrong conception of the fact, not of the law, that the Jews stoned St. Stephen, and would gladly have stoned our Lord Himself. The capital punishment of the murderer in vers. 17, 21, is not to be considered as a part simply of the *lex talionis*, but rather as a positive Divine command given in accordance with Gen. ix. 6. The *lex talionis* on the other hand, of vers. 19, 20, is permissive and restrictive, like so much else in the Mosaic legislation. The fundamental principle which should govern man's conduct towards his neighbor is given in xix. 18; but as the people were so little able to bear this, the ancient indulgence of unlimited revenge is restricted at least to the equivalent of the injury suffered. After the announcement of these general laws, the people carried into execution the sentence pronounced upon the Egyptian blasphemer.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The fundamental moral laws apply equally to all mankind. No one can be exempted from them on the ground that he is not in covenant relation with their author, or does not acknowledge himself to be bound by them.

II. Blasphemy against God is a crime of the deepest character, and demands the severest punishment.

III. Exact justice demands the restoration to one's neighbor of the precise equivalent of any harm done to him, and in case this is a personal injury, of a corresponding injury to the offender. The law of love comes in to forbid the exaction of this penalty on the part of him who is injured; but the same law should lead the offender to restore in more ample measure.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "Blasphemy against the name of Jehovah as the great mortal offence in Israel. Culmination of the revelation of salvation in Christianity; wherefore here especially the death penalty must fall away. The accusation of Christ, that He blasphemed God. The blasphemy in the New Testament era, above all others, a blasphemy against the grace of God in Christ. The name of Jehovah is the witness of His covenant truth.—The fearful decree of death which lies in this blasphemy itself."

The evil of marriages with the ungodly is here apparent; also the influence of an ungodly father upon the life and character of his child. The law requires every accusation to be substantiated by the most solemn act of the accuser; no one has the right to bring a charge against another to the truth of which he cannot positively testify, and which he is not prepared to support in such wise that, if untrue, guilt must recoil on his own head. The equality of all men before the law of God is here, as every. where in the law, made very prominent. In the sufferance of the law of revenge, we see that God's will is not always to be known by what

He may permit to sinful man; He suffers many things "for the hardness of their hearts." All these commands, and all commands given to man rest upon the ultimate ground **I am the LORD your God.**

But little is said in the New Testament of blasphemy, God's displeasure at this sin having been expressed so plainly in the Old, and His will remaining always unalterably the same.

FOURTH SECTION.

Of the Sabbatical and Jubilee Years.

"The keeping holy of the hallowed territory, the holy land, by the Sabbatical year; of the consecrated inheritance by the Jubilee Year, and thus also of those who had become impoverished, the Israelites who had fallen into servitude; the keeping holy of the outward appearance of the holy land (streets and ways); of the public Sabbath feast and of the Sanctuary of the religion of the land. Ch. xxv. 1—xxvi. 2."—LANGE.

CHAPTER XXV. 1–55.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses in mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land which I give you,
3 then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the LORD. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard [fruit garden[1]], and gather in
4 the fruit thereof; but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the LORD: thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard
5 [fruit garden[1]]. [2] That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed:[3] *for* it is a year of rest
6 unto the land. And the sabbath of the land shall be meat for you; for thee, and for thy servant,[4] and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy stranger
7 that sojourneth with thee, and for thy cattle, and for the beasts [animals[5]] that *are* in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be meat.
8 And thou shalt number seven sabbaths[6] of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths[6] of years shall be unto thee forty and
9 nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubile to sound [cause the sound of the cornet to go through *the land*[7]] on the tenth *day* of the seventh month, in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout
10 all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout *all* the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a jubile[8] unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Vers. 3, 4. כַּרְמְךָ. See Textual Note [6] on xix. 10.

[2] Ver. 5. The Sam., LXX. and Syr. prefix the conjunction.

[3] Vers. 5, 11. נְזִיר means primarily *the separated* (see Gen. xlix. 26; Deut. xxxiii. 16), then *the consecrated.* Except in the passages referred to, and in this chap, it is always used of the *Nazarite.* It is applied to the vine either as for this year consecrated, so LXX. ἁγιάσματος σου; or by a figure of speech, *thy Nazarite vine*, as having its branches unpruned like the unshorn locks of the Nazarite. The latter is generally preferred by the commentators. See Keil who refers to the Latin *viridis coma*, Tibull. i. 7, 34; Propert. ii. 15, 12. Ten MSS, the Syr. and Vulg. read the word in the plural.

[4] Ver. 6. The Sam. and Syr. read this and the three following words in the plural.

[5] Ver. 7. וְלִחַיָּה. See Textual Note [1] on xi. 2.

[6] Ver. 8. Sabbath is used here as in xxiii. 15 (see note there) rather in a figurative way than with the definite sense of *weeks.*

[7] Ver. 9. The word יוֹבֵל=*Jubile* of ver. 10 does not occur in this verse, and there is no occasion for its insertion. The שׁוֹפַר תְּרוּעָה is the loud sound, *clangor*, of an instrument usually translated *trumpet* in the A. V., but occasionally (1 Chron. xv. 28; 2 Chron. xv. 14; Ps. xcviii. 6, *etc.*) more correctly *cornet.* It was either the horn of an animal (according to the Mishna, of chamois or wild goat), or made of metal in the fashion of a horn. The LXX. renders σάλπιγξ, the Vulg. *buccina.*

[8] Vers. 10, 11, 12, 13, *etc.* יוֹבֵל is translated throughout this chapter and ch. xxvii, *jubile.* So also Num. xxxvi. 4. In Ex. xix. 13 it is rendered *trumpet* (marg. *cornet*), and in the only other places where it occurs, Josh. vi. 4. 5, 6, 8, 13, *ram's horns.* Outside of the Bible the word is always spelt *jubilee*, but being here spelt *jubile*, Clark considers that it was intended to be pronounced as a dissyllable, making a close imitation of the Heb. word. Authorities differ as to its sense etymologically. See the subject discussed in Bochart, Hieroz. I. c. 43 (vol. I., pp. 463-466 ed. Rosen.), and Gesen. *Thes. s. v.* The LXX. renders ἄφεσις with relation to what was to be done in this year rather than as a translation of the Heb. word.

11 return every man unto his family. A jubile[8] shall that fiftieth year be unto you:
ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather *the*
12 *grapes* in it of thy vine undressed.[3] For it *is* the jubile;[8] it shall be holy unto
you: ye shall eat the increase thereof out of the field.
13 In the year of this jubile[8] ye shall return every man unto his possession.
14 And if thou sell[9] ought unto thy neighbor, or buyest *ought* of thy neighbor's hand,
15 ye shall not oppress [overreach[10]] one another: according to the number of years
after the jubile[8] thou shalt buy of thy neighbor, *and* according unto the number
16 of years of the fruits he shall sell unto thee: according to the multitude of years
thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to the fewness of years thou
shalt diminish the price of it: for *according* to the number *of the years* of the fruits
17 doth he sell unto thee. Ye shall not therefore oppress [overreach[10]] one another;
but thou shalt fear thy God: for I *am* the LORD your God.
18 Wherefore ye shall do my statutes and keep my judgments, and do them; and
19 ye shall dwell in the land in safety. And the land shall yield her fruit, and ye
20 shall eat your fill, and dwell therein in safety. And if ye shall say, What shall
we eat the seventh year? behold, we shall not sow, nor gather in our increase:
21 then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring
22 forth fruit for three years. And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat *yet* of old
fruit until the ninth year; until her fruits come in ye shall eat *of* the old *store*.
23 The land shall not be sold for ever:[11] for the land *is* mine; for ye *are* strangers
24 and sojourners with me. And in all the land of your possession ye shall grant a
25 redemption for the land. If thy brother be waxen poor, and hath sold away *some*
of his possession, and if any of his kin come to redeem it, then shall he redeem that
26 which his brother sold. And if the man have none to redeem it, and himself be
27 [has become[12]] able to redeem it; then let him count the years of the sale thereof,
and restore the overplus unto the man to whom he sold it: that he may return
28 unto his possession. But if he be not able to restore *it* to him, then that which is
sold shall remain in the hand of him that hath bought it until the year of jubile:[8]
and in the jubile[8] it shall go out, and he shall return unto his possession.
29 And if a man sell a dwelling house in a walled city, then he may redeem it
within a whole year after it is sold; *within* a full year [a term of days[13]] may he
30 redeem it. And if it be not redeemed with the space of a full year, then the house
that *is* in the walled city shall be established for ever to him[14] that bought it
31 throughout his generations: it shall not go out in the jubile.[8] But the houses of
the villages which have no wall round about them shall be counted[15] as the fields
of the country: they may be redeemed, and they shall go out in the jubile.[8]
32 Notwithstanding [But concerning[16]] the cities of the Levites, *and* [*omit and*] the
33 houses of the cities of their possession, may the Levites redeem at any time. And
if a man purchase of the Levites,[17] then the house that was sold, and [in[18]] the city

Josephus (*Ant.* III. 12, 3) uses the Heb. word *ἰωβήλος*, which he explains as meaning liberty, *ἐλευθερίαν δὲ σημαίνει τοὔνομα*. The Vulg. has *jubileus*. In Ezek. xlvi. 17 it is called שְׁנַת הַדְּרוֹר=*the year of liberty*, from which Josephus probably derived his interpretation. This accords well with the context in ver. 11, and also with the derivation from יָבַל=*to flow freely*.

[9] Ver. 14. The Heb. has the verb in the plural; but the Sam. has the sing. in accordance with the sing. pronouns following. The word buy, קָנֹה, is inf. abs., as in Gen. xli. 43.

[10] Ver. 14. אִישׁ אֶת־תּוֹנוֹ. The verb יָנָה in the Hiph. applies especially to that sort of civil oppression brought about by fraud, which is best expressed in English by the word overreach.

[11] Ver. 23. לִצְמִתֻת, lit. *for cutting off* (as in marg. A. V.), *viz.* from all hope of redemption. In modern phrase, *in perpetuity*.

[12] Ver. 26. The marg. *his hand hath attained and found sufficiency* exactly renders the Heb.; but the text of the A. V. is a sufficiently good translation except in failing to bring out the idea that the ability to redeem has come about since the sale took place. The Jewish interpretation was accordingly correct, that the right of redemption should only accrue in case the ability to re-purchase was gained *after* the sale had taken place; a merely voluntary sale must hold until the jubilee year.

[13] Ver. 29. יְמֵי תִהְיֶה גְאֻלָּתוֹ, lit. *days shall its redemption be, i. e.* the right of redemption shall continue for a definite time and no longer, which time has been explained in the previous clause to be a year; it is better, however, to let the translation follow the Heb. than to paraphrase so much as has been done in the A. V.

[14] Ver. 30. The k'ri לוֹ for the text לֹא is also the reading of the Sam. and of thirteen MSS.

[15] Ver. 31. יֵחָשֵׁב is sing. The Sam., LXX. and Syr. have the plural.

[16] Ver. 32. On this use of the particle וְ see Nordheimer's *Heb. Gr.* § 1093, 6, c, h. It is evident that there is nothing said about the redemption of the *cities*, which the form of the A. V. would seem to imply, but only of the houses in them.

[17] Ver. 33. There is much diversity of opinion as to the meaning of this clause. The text of the A. V. is supported by

of his possession, shall go out in *the year of* jubile:[8] for the houses of the cities of
34 the Levites *are* their possession among the children of Israel. But the field of the
suburbs of their cities may not be sold; for it *is* their perpetual possession.
35 And if thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee; then thou
shalt relieve him: *yea, though he be* a stranger [poor, and his hand trembles by
thee, thou shalt hold him up *as* a stranger[19]], or a sojourner; that he may live[20]
36 with thee. Take thou no usury of him, or increase: but fear thy God; that thy
37 brother may live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor
38 lend him thy victuals for increase. I *am* the LORD your God, which brought you
forth out of the land of Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, *and* to be your God.
39 And if thy brother *that dwelleth* by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee;
40 thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bondservant: *but* as an hired servant, *and*
as a sojourner, he shall be with thee, *and* shall serve thee unto the year of jubile:[8]
41 and *then* shall he depart from thee, *both* he and his children with him, and shall
return unto his own family, and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return.
42 For they *are* my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: they
43 shall not be sold as bondmen. Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor; but shalt
44 fear thy God. Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have,
shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen
45 and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among
you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that *are* with you, which they begat
46 in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an
inheritance for your children after you, to inherit *them for* a possession; they shall
be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall
not rule one over another with rigor.
47 And if a sojourner or stranger wax rich by thee, and thy brother *that dwelleth* by
him wax poor, and sell himself unto the stranger *or*[21] sojourner by thee, or to the stock
48 of the stranger's family: after that he is sold he may be redeemed again; one of his
49 brethren may redeem him; either his uncle, or his uncle's son, may redeem him,
or *any* that is nigh of kin[22] unto him of his family may redeem him; or if he be
50 able, he may redeem himself. And he shall reckon with him that bought him
from the year that he was sold to him unto the year of jubile:[8] and the price of
his sale shall be according unto the number of years, according to the time of an
51 hired servant shall it be with him. If *there be* yet many years *behind*, according
unto them he shall give again the price of his redemption out of the money that
52 he was bought for. And if there remain but few years unto the year of jubile,[8]
then he shall count with him, *and* according unto his years shall he give him again
53 the price of his redemption. *And* as a yearly hired servant shall he be with him:
54 *and the other* shall not rule with rigor over him in thy sight. And if he be not
redeemed in these *years* [by these *means*[23]], then he shall go out in the year of jubi-

the LXX. and by the Targums, and is defended by Keil. A difficulty arises from the use of the word יִגְאַל=*redeem;* but Keil maintains, on the authority of the Rabbins, that this is used in the sense of קָנָה=*to buy.* He grounds the usage on the fact that the Levitical cities were originally assigned to the tribes as a part of their inheritance; they relinquished the houses, or a part of the houses in them (together with pasture grounds) to the Levites for dwelling-places. When therefore one of another tribe purchased of a Levite, he was in fact *redeeming* the inheritance of his tribe. So Murphy. On the other hand, the reading: *If one of the Levites redeems a house in the city* (according to the marg. of the A. V.), is preferred by Clark following Rosenmüller, De Wette, Kranold, Herxheimer and others. The meaning will then be, that if a Levite has sold a house to one of another tribe, and another Levite redeem it, then in the Jubilee year it must revert to its original possessor. But it is more than questionable whether the Levites had any such general right of redemption on behalf of their fellow Levites as this would suppose. The Vulg. inserts a negative, *Si redemptœ (sc. œdes) non fuerint,* and this is sustained by Houbigant, and preferred by Woide, Ewald, Bunsen and Knobel. It is adopted by Lange in the translation and exegesis; but it is a serious objection that it would require a change in the Heb. On the whole, the text of the A. V. seems best sustained, and gives the clearest sense.

18 Ver. 33. On the use of ו in the figure *Hendiadys* see Gesen. *s. v.* I, b.

19 Ver. 35. The particle *as* is inserted here by the LXX., Vulg., Targums, Luther, *etc.*, and is recognized as to be supplied by many commentators, as Keil, Clark and others. So also Riggs. On the other hand the Syr. gives just the opposite sense: thou shalt not hold him for a sojourner or foreigner; but he shall live with thee. Others, as Lange, adopt the sense expressed in the A. V.

20 Ver. 35. וְחָי according to Keil, an abbreviation for וְחָיָ occurring only here.

21 Ver. 47. The missing conjunction is supplied in ten MSS., the LXX. and Syr.

22 Ver. 49. See Textual Note [4] on xviii. 6.

23 Ver. 54. The Heb. does not express the noun at all. That supplied by the marg. of the A. V. is clearly more agreeable to the context than that in the text. So Lange, following the Syr. The other ancient versions do not supply the ellipsis.

55 le,[8] *both* he, and his children with him. For unto me the children of Israel *are* servants; they *are* my servants whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: I *am* the LORD your God.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

This chapter, with the first two verses of the following one, forms another *Parashah.* or proper lesson of the law; the parallel lesson from the prophets is Jer. xxxii. 6-27, concerning Jeremiah's redemption of Hanameel's field in Anathoth. This and the following chapter, which is the conclusion of the book proper, form a single Divine communication. "The institution of the jubilee years corresponds to the institution of the day of atonement (ch. xvi.). Just as all the sins and uncleannesses of the whole congregation, which had remained unatoned for and uncleansed in the course of the year, were to be wiped away by the all-embracing expiation of the yearly recurring day of atonement, and an undisturbed relation to be restored between Jehovah and His people; so, by the appointment of the year of jubilee, the disturbance and confusion of the divinely appointed relations, which had been introduced in the course of time through the inconstancy of all human or earthly things, were to be removed by the appointment of the year of Jubilee, and the kingdom of Israel to be brought back to its original condition." Keil. The systematic character and correspondence of the two great divisions of Leviticus are thus brought into view.

The institution of the Sabbatical year occupies the first seven verses, and that of the year of Jubilee, with its effects upon rights and property, the remainder of the chapter. The latter may be subdivided into the institution itself (vers. 8-12); the legal return of every man to his own land, and the effect of this on contracts (vers. 13-34); and finally the emancipation of the Hebrew slave with its consequences (vers. 35-55). "The Sabbatical year and the year of Jubilee belong to that great Sabbatical system which runs through the religious observances of the law. They were solemnly connected with the sacred Covenant." Clark. They are therefore appropriately placed immediately after the "appointed seasons" of the previous chapter; yet they are also somewhat separated from these, as "they were distinguished by no religious ceremonies, they were accompanied by no act of religious worship. There were no sacrifices, nor Holy Convocations belonging to them." Although forming a part of the Hebrew ecclesiastical system, they were yet chiefly marked in their effects by their civil and social relations. As the whole civil polity of Israel was fundamentally theocratic, so were these remarkable provisions in their national life placed upon a religious basis.

"There are perhaps in the whole ancient world no institutions bearing comparison with the Hebrew year of release and of Jubilee, either in comprehensiveness or in loftiness of principle. It is impossible to appreciate too highly the wonderful consistency with which the Sabbath was made the foundation of a grand series of celebrations extending from the Sabbath-day to the Sabbath-month, and the Sabbath-year, and lastly to a great Sabbath-period of years. And all these institutions were associated with ideas admirably calculated to foster both a sense of dignity and humility, both zeal in practical pursuits and spiritual elevation, both prudence and charity." Kalisch.

"The fundamental thought is: Jehovah is the Lord of the land of Jehovah, with all its blessings, with its soil and its harvests, with its inheritances and its dwellings, with its rich and its poor, with its free and its slaves, its roads and its bye-ways, its holy seasons, the Sabbath days and its central holy place, the Tabernacle." Lange.

Vers. 1–7. **In mount Sinai** clearly means in the region about the mountain, as in vii. 38; xxvi. 46; xxvii. 34, *etc.* "Mount Sinai is emphasized to allow the immediately following ordinance to come into prominence as a prophecy of the distant future." Lange. Neither the Sabbatical nor the Jubilee year were to be observed until the settlement of the people in the promised land. On ver. 4 Lange quotes Keil as follows: "The omission of sowing and reaping presupposed that the Sabbatical year commenced with the civil year, in the autumn of the sixth year of labor, and not with the ecclesiastical year, on the first of Abib (Nisan), and that it lasted till the Autumn of the seventh year, when the cultivation of the land would commence again with the preparation of the ground and the sowing of the seed for the eighth year; and with this the command to proclaim the jubilee year 'on the tenth day of the seventh month' throughout all the land (ver. 9), and the calculation in vers. 21, 22, fully agree." On the expression *Sabbath Sabbathon* of ver. 4, see Textual Note 2 on xxiii. 3. In vers. 4-7 all agricultural labor is forbidden for the Sabbatical year. Two questions arise: how were the wants of the people to be provided for during the year? and how was the time thus freed from its usual employments to be spent? In regard to the first, reference is usually made to the great productiveness of the land, and to the fact that there would be a considerable spontaneous growth of grain, while the fruit trees and the vine would of course bear nearly as usual. Greater use would also have been made of animal food by those who possessed cattle, or were able to purchase it, and the uncropped fields would have allowed of the support of herds and flocks in unusual numbers. These facts lessen the difficulty, and indeed remove it altogether for the wealthy and for the poor also during several months of the year; all this spontaneous produce was common property, and might be gathered by any one for immediate use but not stored. Undoubtedly during the time of the ripening of the various cereals there would thus be abundant provision for the wants of the whole population. But after all, the main reliance must have been upon the stores laid up previously in view of the coming on of the Sabbatical year, and this is pointed out in vers. 20, 21. It is also to be noticed that only agricul-

tural labor was suspended, and that the commerce of the cities went on as usual. In regard to the employment of the time: the command is given in Deut. xxxi. 10-12, that at the feast of Tabernacles in this year the law should be read in the hearing of all the people, including not merely the men who were alone required in other years to assemble at the feast, but also the women and children. This provision, joined with the analogy of the seventh day, shows that the leisure of the Sabbatical year was to be improved in acquiring a knowledge of the Divine law, and doubtless in renewing family ties and associations. It is distinguished not as an idle year, but as a year of intellectual and moral, rather than of manual occupation. Other passages in the law on this subject are Ex. xxiii. 10, 11, and Deut. xv. 1-18. The latter is the most detailed of all, and provides for the release in that year of all debts due from Israelites, and of all Israelites in bond-service. The Sabbatical year was doubtless provided for the sake of man and its bearing upon his spiritual welfare; yet when the law pronounces (ver. 2) **the land shall keep a Sabbath unto the LORD**, we are forced to see a symbolical significance in the very rest of the land itself. "The earth was to be saved from the hand of man exhausting its power for earthly purposes as his own property, and to enjoy the holy rest with which God had blessed the earth and all its productions after the creation. From this, Israel, as the nation of God, was to learn, on the one hand, that although the earth was created for man, it was not merely created for him to draw out its powers for his own use, but also to be holy to the Lord, and participate in His blessed rest; and on the other hand, that the great purpose for which the congregation of the Lord existed, did not consist in the uninterrupted tilling of the earth, connected with bitter labor in the sweat of his brow (Gen. iii. 17, 19), but in the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of the earth, which the Lord their God had given them, and would give them still without the labor of their hands, if they strove to keep His covenant and satisfy themselves with His grace." Keil. The law of the Sabbatical year was not to come into operation until after the completion of the conquest. It is hardly probable that it was actually observed until the Captivity, see 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, unless possibly a few times in the very beginning of the settlement in Canaan. Later, "there are found several historical notices which imply its observance. The Jews were exempted from tribute in the Sabbatical year by Alexander the Great (Jos. *Ant.* xi. 8, 6), and by Julius Cæsar (*ib.* xiv. 10, 6). The inhabitants of Bethsura could not stand out when besieged by Antiochus Epiphanes, because they had no store of provisions owing to the Sabbatical year (1 Macc. vi. 49), and the inhabitants of Jerusalem suffered from a like cause when they were besieged by Herod (Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 16, 2; xv. 1, 2)." Clark. Tacitus also mentions the Jewish "seventh year given to indolence" (*Hist.* v. 2, 4), and St. Paul (Gal. iv. 10) charges the Judaizers with observing *years* as well as days and months.

Vers. 8–12. The institution of the year of Jubilee. The present chapter contains the whole literature of the Jubilee year to be found in the Pentateuch, except the discussion of its effect upon fields dedicated to the Lord in xxvii. 16-25, and except also the allusion in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad, Num. xxxvi. 4. Lange: "The relation of the last Sabbatical year to the Jubilee year itself creates a special difficulty. If the people did not sow or reap during two years, there would result a stoppage of four years." [This seems to overlook the fact that the Jubilee was proclaimed on the 10th Tisri, when the whole work of the agricultural year had been rounded out and completed, so that the break of two years, serious as this was, did not extend either forward or backward in its effects beyond those years themselves.—F. G.]. "On this account it has indeed been supposed that the 49th year itself was the Jubilee year (see Keil, p. 162 [Trans. p. 458]. Art. *Sabbath* and *Jobeljahr* in Herzog's *Real-encyclopädie*)." [This view was first advocated by R. Jehuda, and has been adopted by Scaliger, Usher, Petavius, Rosenmüller, and others, and hesitatingly by Clark in his commentary. It is entirely rejected by Keil as contradictory to the plain language of the text, and by Clark in his Art. *Jubilee* in Smith's *Bibl. Dict.* The text (vers. 8-11) is perfectly plain, using the same forms of language as in regard to the feast of Pentecost after the completion of the seven weeks, between which and this Pentecostal year there is a clear analogy. Notwithstanding the authority of the critics above referred to, it must be considered as certain that the Jubilee followed the seventh Sabbatical year, and that thus once in every half century two fallow years were to occur together. The provisions for food were the same in the one case as in the other: no agricultural labor was to be performed, but the spontaneous productions of the earth were the common property of the whole population. Large reliance must therefore have been placed upon food previously stored and, perhaps, on foreign commerce.—F. G.] "We see from the book of Jeremiah that this feast was poorly kept in Israel, not on account of apprehended need, but in consequence of the hardening effect of proprietary relations, and the hard-heartedness of the powerful and great (Knobel, p. 563. Jer. xxxiv.). But the year of Jubilee formed the culmination of the ideal relations of Israel which the law aimed at without actually reaching. . . . It is most full of significance that on the 10th of the 7th month (at the end of the seven Sabbatical years on the great day of Atonement, without doubt immediately after the full accomplishment of the propitiation) the trombone was to sound through all the land to announce the year of Jubilee as a year of freedom (דְּרוֹר), the highest feast of the laborer, and of nature, the redemption of lost inheritances, the ransom of the enslaved, the year of the restoration of all things (Isa. lxi.). The instrument of the announcement is the trombone, the horn (שׁוֹפָר), the sound of which יוֹבֵל had proclaimed also the feast of the covenant of the law." After the solemn quiet of the day when all the people must "afflict their souls," and when the great rites of the annual propitiation had been completed, probably at the

time of the evening sacrifice, the sudden burst of sound proclaiming the year of Jubilee must have been peculiarly impressive. The proclamation of freedom was most appropriate just after the great reconciliation of the people with God had been symbolically completed. The chief allusions to this year in the prophets are Isa. lxi. 1, 2; Jer. xxxii. 6-15; Ezek. vii. 12, 13; xlvi. 16-18.

Vers. 13–34. In the year of Jubilee every man was to return to his inherited possession. The principle on which this law is based is given in ver. 23: The land was the absolute possession of Jehovah alone; He had allotted it to the families of Israel as **strangers and sojourners** with Him, and however these allotments might be temporarily disturbed in the exigencies of life, in the Jubilee they must all be restored again. Ver. 14. **Sell aught** refers only to land and houses in the country. Personal property (except slaves) was not affected by the Jubilee as debts were by the Sabbatical year (Deut. xv. 1-11). The price of the land was determined (vers. 15, 16) by the value of the harvests remaining until the Jubilee. "In the valuation of the harvest there was always opportunity for fraud; therefore the earnest warning not to oppress [**overreach**] one's neighbor." Lange. Vers. 20-22 relate in terms to the sabbatical year, but only in regard to the supply of food. This is, of course, equally applicable to the Jubilee year, and thus both cases are covered. The question arises in connection with the latter, but needs also to be answered for the former, and is therefore arranged with reference to that as the more frequently recurring. The verses stand therefore quite in their proper place; if placed, as various critics would have them, just after ver. 7, the Jubilee year could only be provided for by a repetition. Vers. 23-28. Lange: "The land shall not be sold even to defeasance, *i. e.*, completely. It shall also not be sold absolutely; the form is not an hereditary lease, once for all, but a temporary lease for a course of years.— **For the land is Mine**, Jehovah says, and **ye are strangers and sojourners with Me.**— Therefore the soil throughout the whole land was placed under the law of redemption. Also redemption could take place before the 50th year if the nearest *Goel* or redeemer of the impoverished man stepped in and bought back for his benefit that which had been alienated. If the redeemers (relatives, according to their degrees of relationship, having the ability and the will) failed, then the case was conceivable that the impoverished man himself might come into the possession of means before the 50th year, and then the redemption was reserved to him according to the usufruct of the yet remaining years." If neither of these means of redemption were availed of, then the law of reversion absolutely and without consideration came into play in the Jubilee year. There could never be injustice in this, as all purchases had been made with a full knowledge of the law. The law, **if thy brother be waxen poor**, throughout presupposes that no Israelite would sell his inheritance except under the pressure of poverty. Comp. 1 Kings xxi. 3.

Vers. 29–34. The alienation and redemption of houses (*a*) of the people generally, vers. 29-31; (*b*) of the Levites, vers. 32-34. (*a*) Lange: "A dwelling-house within a walled city could be redeemed within the space of the first year, but not afterwards. The law could not be brought to bear upon the more fixed relations of cities without prejudice to justice and order. The reason certainly is not that the houses in the cities belonged "to the full proprietorship of their possessors." The possessors themselves were really tenants of Jehovah." [The law of redemption relates to land, and is based upon the original division of the land among the families of Israel. In cities the original value of the land constituted but a small part of the value of a house; the rest was the creation of human industry. The property represented by the original value of the land is recognized in the right of redemption for a year, which also concurred with the general purpose of the law in checking the sale of real estate; but beyond this the house in the city was justly treated as of the nature of personal property. Calvin also observes justly that there was not the same objection to the falling of city houses into the hands of the wealthy as of those in the country. On the one hand, the expense of maintaining them was greater, and could be better borne by the wealthy; and on the other, the possession of a house was not at all as necessary to a poor man in the city as in the country where he could scarcely otherwise find shelter.—F. G.] "But the houses in open places were put, as an appurtenance to the farm, under the law of redemption within the fiftieth year, or of reversion at the end of that period." (*b*) See the Textual Notes on vers. 32, 33. Lange, in his translation and exegesis of ver. 33, follows the Vulgate, and objects to the view of Keil as too subtle, and as inapplicable to the clause: **and the city of his possession.** The latter objection is removed by considering this as a *hendiadys*, and translating **in the city.** Lange considers that the clause "has something like these the senses: even houses of the Levites fall back again, even if they were the whole city. Or again: only by this means the Levitical cities remain guaranteed as such." The pasturage of the Levites was absolutely inalienable, even temporarily (ver. 34), and the reason for extending the law of redemption to their houses in the cities is evidently that they had no other inheritance, and it was therefore necessary in this to assimilate them to the rest of the people that they might enjoy the same safeguards against hopeless poverty with their brethren. This provision applied to the priests also, who constituted one family of the Levites, and were in the same situation as their brethren in regard to landed property. It is noticeable on the one hand that this is the only mention of the Levites in this book; and on the other, that the provision of cities for them had not yet been announced. Both facts admit of the easy explanation that the whole legislation had been communicated to Moses in the Mount, so that any part of it may presuppose another; but that he was to announce it to the people in the order best adapted to their needs. The Levites are not therefore spoken of in this book, except thus incidentally in order to keep them distinct from the priests;

and the law in regard to the redemption of their houses in their cities is given to complete the law of Jubilee; but the assignment of the cities themselves is reserved to the directions for the division of the land.

Vers. 35-55. The emancipation of the Hebrew slave with its consequences. The main subject is still the law of Jubilee; but in connection with the effect of this upon the Hebrew slave, the treatment of the poor generally is spoken of.—**And if thy brother,** *i. e.* an Israelite, **be waxen poor,** he was not to be treated as an outcast, but with the consideration shown to a resident foreigner, who also had no landed possession. Vers. 36, 37, forbid the taking of **usury of him, or increase.** In the latter verse this is applied also to the furnishing of food. It is entirely clear that the prohibition is not simply of what is now commonly called *usurious interest*, but of any interest whatever. There was no law regulating the amount of interest; no interest was allowed to be taken of a Hebrew brother, and no limitation was put upon that which might be demanded of a foreigner. Lange, however, considers the words: **a stranger or a sojourner** (ver. 35) as in apposition with the pronoun **him**, and taking the view expressed in the A. V., says: "It is very noticeable that this holds good also of the foreigner." See Textual Note 19. Lange adds: "Jehovah says this, the great Benefactor, who has delivered His Israel out of Egypt, and purposes to give him the whole land of Canaan, in order to make him, through thankfulness, like-minded with his God." (Ver. 38.) Vers. 39-43. Hebrew servants to Hebrews. The law provides that such servants shall not be treated as ordinary slaves entirely dependent upon the will of their master, but rather as simply under a contract, like a hired servant. In Ex. xxi. 1-4 it has already been provided that the term of servitude for the Israelites should not extend beyond six years, and in the seventh they should go out free; it is now further provided, as an almost necessary supplement to that law, that, whatever the number of years he might chance to have served, he should go free in the Jubilee when the land of his inheritance reverted to him, and would need his care. "Through this principle slavery was completely abolished, so far as the people of the theocracy were concerned." Oehler. In Ex. the freedom of his wife and children is also assured, unless the wife be one given him by his master, and therefore his slave. In that case the wife and children remained the master's, and the same qualification is doubtless to be understood of ver. 41 here. In Ex. xxi. 5, 6, provision is made for the case of a slave who preferred to continue with his master; it would have been unnecessary at any rate to mention this unusual exception here; but probably it applied only to the ordinary release in the seventh year of service, and was not intended to take place also at the Jubilee. If the slave freed at the Jubilee chose to go back to his master, he could of course do so, but could only devote himself to perpetual servitude after another six years' service. Vers. 42, 43. Lange: "The Israelites were not allowed to become men's slaves, because they were God's slaves. The Jews could misinterpret these noble words in arrogance in opposition to the heathen (Jno. viii.); but Christian industry has read them too little." Vers. 44-46. Heathen slaves of Hebrew masters. The Israelites, in common with all nations of their time, were permitted to hold heathen slaves. It was a patriarchal custom of long standing, and the supply was kept up by natural descent, by purchase from foreigners, and by captives taken in war. The people were not yet prepared for the abrogation of this, and in consequence the Mosaic law permits its continuance, but in many ways mitigates its rigor (see Ex. xxi. 16, 21, 26, 27), especially by providing that the slave might adopt the religion of his master, and be circumcised, and thus entitled to all the privileges of a Hebrew servant (comp. Ex. xii. 44). This had certainly been done with all the slaves of Abraham, and probably with those of Isaac and Jacob. It is likely that no inconsiderable portion of the Israelites of the time of Moses were the descendants of slaves thus manumitted. Vers. 47-55. Hebrew servants to foreign masters. By this addition all possible cases of servitude are covered. Lange: "The prohibition of oppressive power against an Israelite brother occurs again ver. 43, and again ver. 46. So strongly were the Israelites now bound to charitableness and to the fostering of freedom; so strongly also was the power of the stranger and foreigner coming into Israel limited in relation to heathen encroachments upon the Jewish right of freedom. If an impoverished Jew sold himself or his house to a foreigner, any one of his kindred might become his redeemer, the brother, the uncle, the uncle's son, or any blood relation; also he might redeem himself, if he had laid by enough for the purpose. Everything breathed the tendency to freedom; but it was conditioned by law. The price of the redemption was fixed according to the years which he had yet to serve to the year of Jubilee, and according to the usual wages. In case there was no redemption, he was set free in the year of Jubilee. At the close occurs yet once more the solemn sanction of the law, ver. 55." This law evidently contemplates the acquisition of wealth by foreigners residing in Israel, and their living in undisturbed prosperity. The Hebrew slave of a Hebrew was released without redemption after six years of service, and also in the year of Jubilee whenever that might occur; but apparently the law of Ex. xxi. does not apply to foreign masters, and here nothing is said of release, except by redemption, until the Jubilee. This would be a strong inducement to an impoverished Hebrew to sell himself to an Israelite rather than a foreigner, and concurs with the general tendency of the law to discourage any subjection to foreigners.

Lange connects the first two verses of the following chapter with this section as is done in the Jewish *Parashah*. They seem, however, to belong to the general conclusion of the book contained in the following chapter.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. Lange (under Exegetical): "The chosen land, seen from a distance, appears as a paradi-

saical world, inexhaustible in fruitfulness. . . . But it is to be particularly noticed that the prescribed Sabbath rest of the land forced the people back again to the inexhaustible source of food in the breeding of cattle, and so far to simple Idyllic relations; the breaking the hardness of purchase and property relations would further the return of Idyllic simplicity, soften the differences of rank, and above all, avert the so-called proletarian relations, and glorify Jehovah as the gentle sovereign Lord and manor Lord of the families of Israel joined together in brotherhood. By this also comfort was brought to the cattle, and even to the wild animal. In later times the turbulent, restless pressing on of industry is not appeased by voluntary or legal times of rest and years of remission, but indeed by commercial crises, civil catastrophes and extraordinary helps in necessity; but the proper ideas or ideal of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years have not yet come to be clearly seen in the Christian consciousness of the time." What is noted by H. Spencer as the rythmic flow of all things in the universe is provided for in regard to human activity in this wonderful legislation; the disastrous consequences attending its absence are noted above by Lange.

II. Lange (also under Exeg.): "The limitation of human proprietary right to the soil has also its permanent ideal significance. God challenges to Himself the royal right over terrestrial nature, as a clear idea of this is given indeed in the winter storm over the sea, the Alpine glacier and the deserts. Man is inclined, in his egotistical industry, to harass nature as his beast."

III. "Looking at the law of Jubilee from a simply practical point of view, its operation must have tended to remedy those evils which are always growing up in the ordinary conditions of human society. It prevented the permanent accumulation of land in the hands of a few, and periodically raised those whom fault or misfortune had sunk into poverty to a position of competency. It must also have tended to keep alive family feeling, and helped to preserve the family genealogies. . . . . But in its more special character, as a law given by Jehovah to His peculiar people, it was a standing lesson to those who would rightly regard it, on the terms upon which the enjoyment of the land of Promise had been conferred upon them. All the land belonged to Jehovah as its supreme Lord, every Israelite as His vassal belonged to Him." Clark.

IV. The law of slavery as understood among ancient nations generally is here essentially modified and softened, the Levitical precepts tending in the same direction with those of the Gospel which, after so long a time, have now nearly effected its abolition throughout the civilized world. But in regard to the Hebrews themselves, the law went much further, and substantially abolished slavery at once, reducing it to a six years' service, and even this interrupted by the year of Jubilee, and subject to many restrictions. It is still further to be remembered that any foreign slave might be admitted to the privileges of the Hebrew, by becoming an Israelite through the reception of circumcision. Thus strongly did the law set its face against the institution of slavery.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange (under Exeg.): "The Sabbath year is the germ of the Jubilee year, as this is a type of the New Testament time of deliverance, restoration and freedom (Isa. lxi.; Luke iv. 18), and further, a prelude and a prophecy of the heavenly and eternal Sabbath itself (Heb. iv.)."

Lange (*Homiletik*): "The year of Jubilee of the theocratic land. The great year of rejoicing in the theocratic community. Ideals which have been scantily and scarcely fulfilled in the letter in Israel, but which in Christianity are continually being realized in the spirit. And this indeed in the commendable care of the fields and forests; in the dread of a gross profit out of nature; in the limitation of the proprietary right of individuals over nature; in customs of gentleness; in the consecration of the social right of fellowship; the right of the poor, the right of the laboring man, the right of rent and purchase. The later dismal caricatures of these ideals. Seven years a period after which the administration of nature required a new revision; forty [fifty] years a period after which the arrangements of business required a revision. The neglect of reform a source of revolution. The Jubilee year a type of the Gospel time of deliverance (Isa. lxi.; Luke iv. 16). The true preaching of the Gospel always a proclamation of the true Jubilee year. The Jewish and the Christian emancipation from slavery: 1) its common foundation, 2) its greater difference, 3) its unceasing development in the world."

As the law provided for a redeemer for the poor, so, says Wordsworth, Christ became the Redeemer for the spiritually poor, reinstating us in our lost estate, and delivering us from the bondage of sin; and this He was entitled to do because by His incarnation He took our nature and became our Kinsman.

By the prohibition of sowing and harvesting in the Sabbatical and Jubilee years was again taught that principle which the Israelites learned from the manna in the wilderness, and which the words of Christ make of perpetual validity, that "man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord."

Very full and striking are the provisions of this chapter for the loving care of the poor, not for the sake of the poor only, but for the sake of him who should show them kindness. That the blessing of this lesson might not cease with the Mosaic dispensation, God has provided that we shall have the poor always with us, and our Lord has elevated our ministrations to them into ministrations to Himself. Similarly kindness and consideration towards those who labor for us is taught by Moses, and is ever made one of the prominent practical duties of Christianity. See Eph. vi. 9, *etc.*

PART FOURTH.

Conclusion.—Promises and Threats.

Chapter XXVI. 1–46.

1 Ye shall make you no idols[1] nor graven image,[2] neither rear you up a standing
image,[3] neither shall ye set up *any* image of stone[4] in your land, to bow down unto[5]
2 it: for I *am* the Lord your God. Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and reverence my
sanctuary: I *am* the Lord.
3, 4 If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments, and do them; then
will I give you rain in due season, and the land shall yield her increase, and the
5 trees of the field shall yield their fruit. And your threshing shall reach unto the
vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time: and ye shall eat your
6 bread to the full, and dwell in your land safely. And I will give peace in the land,
and ye shall lie down, and none shall make *you* afraid: and I will rid evil beasts
7 [animals[6]] out of the land, neither shall the sword go through your land. And ye
8 shall chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the sword. And five
of you shall chase an hundred, and an hundred of you shall put ten thousand to
9 flight: and your enemies shall fall before you by the sword. For I will have re-
spect unto you, and make you fruitful, and multiply you, and establish my cove-
10 nant with you. And ye shall eat old store, and bring forth [clear away[7]] the old
11 because of the new. And I will set my tabernacle [dwelling-place[8]] among you:
12 and my soul shall not abhor you. And I will walk among you, and will be your
13 God, and ye shall be my people. I *am* the Lord your God, which brought you
forth out of the land of Egypt, that ye should not be their bondmen: and I have
broken the bands[9] of your yoke, and made you go upright.
14 But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all these commandments;
15 and[10] if ye shall despise my statutes, or if your soul abhor my judgments, so that ye

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 1. אֱלִילִם. See Textual Note [3] on xix. 4.

[2] Ver. 1. פֶּסֶל, from פָּסַל *to carve*, is used of an image of any material, but is here taken, as in Isa. xliv. 15, 17; xlv. 20, of an image of wood.

[3] Ver. 1. מַצֵּבָה lit. *anything set up*. Hence used of a memorial stone, Gen. xxviii. 18-22; xxxv. 14; Isa. xix. 19; answering to the λίθαροι λιπαροί of the ancients. As these came to be used for idolatrous purposes the word obtained it's secondary sense as in the text (Ex. xxiii. 24; 2 Ki. iii. 2, *etc.*). The marg. of the A. V. follows the LXX. στύλην. The Vulg. has *titulum*.

[4] Ver. 1. מַשְׂכִּית does not elsewhere occur in connection with אֶבֶן, but its meaning by itself *figure*, *imagery*, is sufficiently well settled. The only question here is whether the phrase denotes an *image of stone* (A. V. so Keil), or *a stone with images sculptured upon it* (A. V. marg. Rosen.). The latter is probably the more correct view, but not sufficiently certain to warrant a change in the text. LXX. λίθον σκοπὸν apparently in the sense of a *prophylactery*, and of this the Vulg. *lapidem insignem* may be a translation. Targ. Onk., and Jon. and Syr. *stone of adoration*; Targ. Jerus. *stone of error*.

[5] Ver. 1. The construction of עַל here has somewhat perplexed the critics. Geddes contends that as it never elsewhere precedes the object of adoration, it must here signify *at*, *by*, or *upon*. Keil explains it "on the ground that the worshipper of a stone image rises above it (for עַל in this sense, see Gen. xviii. 2)." But this fact is, at the least, very doubtful; and the ordinary meaning of עַל as signifying *motion towards*, *ἐπί*, seems to be all that the connection requires.

[6] Ver. 6. חַיָּה. See Textual Note [1] on xi. 2.

[7] Ver. 10. הוֹצִיאוּ is exactly rendered by the A. V., but the sense intended is better conveyed by the suggested emendation of Clark.

[8] Ver. 11. מִשְׁכָּנִי. See Textual Note [8] on xv. 31.

[9] Ver. 13. "מֹטֹת עֹל, *lit.* the poles of the yoke (comp. Ezek. xxxiv. 27), *i. e.*, the poles which are laid upon the necks of beasts of burden (Jer. xxvii. 2) as a yoke." Keil. For עֹל the Sam. and many MSS. have the fuller form עוֹל.

[10] Ver. 15. The conjunction is wanting in 6 MSS., the Sam., Vulg., and Syr.

16 will not do all my commandments, *but* that ye break my covenant: I also will do
this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror,[11] consumption, and the burning
ague [wasting away, and the burning fever[12]] that shall consume the eyes, and cause
sorrow of heart [the soul to pine away[13]]: and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your
17 enemies shall eat it. And I will set my face against you, and ye shall be slain
before your enemies: they that hate you shall reign over you; and ye shall flee
18 when none pursueth you. And if ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then
19 I will punish you seven times more for your sins. And I will break the pride of
20 your power; and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth as brass: and
your strength shall be spent in vain: for your land shall not yield her increase,
21 neither shall the trees of the land[14] yield their fruits. And if ye walk contrary
unto me, and will not hearken unto me; I will bring seven times more plagues
22 upon you according to your sins. I will also send wild beasts [animals[6]] among
you, which shall rob you of your children [make you childless[15]], and destroy your
23 cattle, and make you few in number; and your *high* ways shall be desolate. And
if ye will not be reformed by me by these things, but will walk contrary unto me;
24 then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for
25 your sins. And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall avenge the quarrel of
[*omit* the quarrel of[16]] *my* covenant: and when ye are gathered together within
your cities, I will send a pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the
26 hand of the enemy. [;] *And* [*omit And*] when I have broken the staff of your bread,
ten women shall bake your bread in one oven, and they shall deliver *you* your bread
27 again by weight: and ye shall eat, and not be satisfied. And if ye will not for all
28 this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto
29 you also in fury; and I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins. And
ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of your daughters shall ye eat.
30 And I will destroy your high places, and cut down your images,[17] and cast your
31 carcases upon the carcases of your idols,[18] and my soul shall abhor you. And I
will make your cities waste, and bring your sanctuaries[19] unto desolation, and I will
32 not smell the savour of your sweet odours. And I will bring the land into desola-
33 tion: and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it. And I will
scatter you among the heathen, and will draw out a sword after you; and your land
shall be desolate, and your cities waste.
34 Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye *be* in
35 your enemies' land; *even* then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths. As
long as it lieth desolate it shall rest; because [all the days of its desolation it shall

[11] Ver. 16. For בַּהֲלָה = *terror* the Sam. reads בַּחֲלָה = *sickness* as a general term including the specifications that follow. The word is rendered in the A. V. of Jer. xv. 8 as here, and in Ps. lxxviii. 33; Isa. lxv. 23, *trouble*. It does not occur elsewhere. The idea is that of "mens' hearts failing them for fear," Luke xxi. 26.

[12] Ver. 16. שַׁחֶפֶת = *wasting away* is well expressed by the *consumption* of the A. V. in its etymological sense, but is in danger of being misunderstood of the specific disease of that name which is rare in Palestine and Syria. The LXX., however, has ψώραν. קַדַּחַת, LXX. πυρετός, according to all authorities should be *burning fever*. Fevers are the most common of all diseases in Syria and the neighboring countries. These words occur only in the parallel, Deut. xxviii. 22.

[13] Ver. 16. מְרִיבַת נָפֶשׁ. The literal translation is more expressive than the paraphrase of the A. V.

[14] Ver. 20. For הָאָרֶץ 21 MSS. and the LXX. read הַשָּׂדֶה.

[15] Ver. 22. שִׁכְלָה אֶתְכֶם. The literal rendering is sufficient.

[16] Ver. 25. נֹקֶמֶת נֶקֶם־בְּרִית *lit.* "avenging the covenant vengeance." As this cannot be expressed in English the נֶקֶם is better left untranslated than rendered by *quarrel*, which it does not mean.

[17] Ver. 30. הַמְּנִיכֶם. In most other places where the word occurs (2 Chr. xiv. 5 (4); xxxiv. 4; Isa. xvii. 8; Ezek. vi. 4) the marg. of the A. V. has *sun-images*. Such was undoubtedly the original meaning of the word; but Gesenius (*Thes.*) shows that the word was applied to images of Baal and Astarte as the deities of the sun and moon. The word indicates "idols of the Canaanitish nature-worship." Keil.

[18] Ver. 30. גִּלֻּלִים = *something to be rolled about*, a contemptuous expression for idols. The Heb. had three different words which are rendered *idol* in the A. V., and seven which are rendered *image*.

[19] Ver. 31. More than 50 MSS., the Sam. and the Syr., have the sing. The plural refers to "the holy things of the worship of Jehovah, the tabernacle and temple, with their altars, and the rest of their holy furniture, as in Ps. lxviii. 36; lxxiv. 6," Keil; and not to the sanctuaries of false gods (Rosen. and others).

[20] Ver. 35. Here also it is better to keep to the literal rendering of the Heb. כָּל־יְמֵי חָשְׁמָה תִּשְׁבַּת אֵת אֲשֶׁר וגו׳ The land should rest not merely **because**, but it should actually rest the time which it had not rested.

36 rest that which[20]] it did not rest in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it. And
upon them that are left *alive* of you I will send a faintness[21] into their hearts in the
lands of their enemies; and the sound of a shaken leaf shall chase them; and they
37 shall flee, as fleeing from a sword; and they shall fall when none pursueth. And
they shall fall one upon another, as it were before a sword, when none pursueth:
38 and ye shall have no power to stand before your enemies. And ye shall perish
39 among the heathen, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up. And they that
are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity[22] in your[23] enemies' lands; and also
in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away with them.
40 If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their
trespass which they trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary
41 unto me; and *that* I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them
into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and
42 they then accept[24] of the punishment of their iniquity: then will I remember my
covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with
Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land.
43 The land also shall be left of them, and shall enjoy her sabbaths, while she lieth
desolate without them: and they shall accept[24] of the punishment of their iniquity:
because, even because they despised my judgments, and because their soul abhorred
my statutes.
44 And yet for all that, when they be in the land of their enemies, I will not cast
them away, neither will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my
45 covenant with them; for I *am* the LORD their God. But I will for their sakes re-
member the covenant of their ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of
Egypt in the sight of the heathen, that I might be their God: I *am* the LORD.
46 These *are* the statutes and judgments and laws, which the LORD made between
him and the children of Israel in mount Sinai by the hand of Moses.

[21] Ver. 36. מֹרֶךְ ἅπ. λεγ. LXX. δειλία, Vulg. *pavor*. It "signifies that inward anguish, fear, and despair, which rend the heart and destroy the life." Keil. Comp. Deut. xxviii. 65.

[22] Ver. 39. עָוֹן is either *iniquity* (as here twice and in the next verse twice), or *the punishment of iniquity* (as in ver. 41). The phrase "perish in one's iniquity" is however sufficiently common, and there is no occasion to change the translation here. The אִתָּם = **with them** at the close of the verse refers to the iniquities.

[23] Ver. 39. For *your* כֶּם־ more than 80 MSS. read *their* הֶם־, so also the Sam., LXX., Sym., Theod., Vulg. and Syr. as the text in ver. 41.

[24] Vers. 41, 43. יִרְצוּ. The same word as is used in vers. 34, 43, **the land shall enjoy her sabbaths.** The literal rendering is perhaps too bold for our version; but the meaning is really this. "The land being desolate shall have the blessing of rest, and they having repented shall have the blessing of chastisement. So the LXX. and Syriac." Clark. Comp. Isa. xl. 2. נִרְצָת עֲוֹנָהּ.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

Lange here again insists that vers. 1 and 2 are properly the close of the foregoing section. It was already too late to adopt his division when his work appeared; but independently of this the connection with the present chap. is preferred. The verses reiterate the most fundamental requirements of the law, and thus form an appropriate introduction to these concluding promises and threats.

The whole precepts and prohibitions of the Book of Leviticus have now been given, and here the people are incited to their faithful observance by promises of blessings on their obedience and curses upon their disobedience. This arrangement is both natural in itself, and is in accordance with the analogy of the warnings and promises (Ex. xxiii. 20-33) at the close of the "Book of the Covenant," (Ex. xx. 22—xxiii. 19) and in the parting exhortations of Moses (Deut. xxix., xxx.). The passage in Exodus, however, relates to the conquest of the land, while here the subsequent history of the nation is had in view. The chapter contains: first, promises upon their obedience (3-13); it then describes the consequences of disobedience (14-39), which are put hypothetically, but evidently contemplated as likely to occur; and finally, looks forward to the restoration of the covenant on the repentance of the people (40-44), which is also put hypothetically, but is evidently prophetic. Ver. 46 forms the conclusion of this whole series of legislation.

Objection has been made to the Mosaic origin of this chap. by rationalistic critics on account of its prophetic character. Certainly it is prophetic, and if this be objected to any portion of Scripture, the objector must be met on other than merely exegetical grounds, but here the rationalistic argument may be fully met in a different way. It is impossible to conceive that the author of the remarkable legislation contained in this book, possessed of as intimate knowledge as he must have been of the people under his charge, should not have foreseen that they would fail to maintain the standard of holiness here required, and that consequently God,

whose holiness and majesty it has been his object to set forth, would visit them for their transgressions. It is but a step beyond this to look forward to the effect of chastisement and humiliation in producing repentance, and when this had been effected, his knowledge of the mercy and loving-kindness of God assured him of the restoration of the people to His favor. See this point admirably treated by Keil in a note on p. 468.

Lange: "The germ of this whole setting forth of blessing and curse already lies in the decalogue itself (Ex. xx. 5, 12), but especially as a conditional promise of blessing in the section Ex. xxiii. 23-33. It is appropriate to the purpose of Leviticus that this germ now comes here to its development, that by the side of the promise of blessing on the keeping of the covenant comes out very explicitly the threatening of curse on the breach of the covenant; for the contrast of blessing and curse goes forth from the religious behaviour or misbehaviour towards the law of God as a whole, as all particular commands are summed up therein. . . . . It must not be overlooked that the subject is here always Israel in its totality, the nation as a whole. The date of this section is thereby shown to be very ancient; for it would have been otherwise from the days of Messianic prophecy. Then the contrast comes forward very strongly: the apostate Israel, and the Israel reforming itself; also the contrast: the Israel of the mass, and the Israel of the poor, of the humble, of the purified remnant. For this reason it would be a false inference to consider the conditional prediction of our section as apodictical, or indeed to suppose that the curse would fall upon every individual of the nation of Israel. The apostasy of Israel has often been treated as if the flower of its elect had fallen under the curse, although history declares that the Gentile church was grafted upon the stock of the Jewish, and Paul can designate the unbelieving portion of the Jews as "some," notwithstanding its numerical majority, in contrast to the dynamical majority whose central point is Christ Himself. The national curse has then been fulfilled only in a conditional degree in contrast to the dynamical blessing overmastering all curse; but nevertheless in a degree which has shown in fearful majesty the reality of the threatening of the curse. It is a vain attempt when one seeks to intimate, like Knobel, that our prophecy looks back upon that which has already occurred in isolated particulars; at all events, this creates no prejudice against its Mosaic origin, for its fulfilment has been progressing even to the present day, and is not yet fully accomplished. Yet even at the present day the emphasis falls upon the fearful realization of the curse upon the nation; upon individuals, however, as such, only in proportion as they transmit the fanatical or unbelieving spirit of the community.

"Our section, moreover, is characterized as a prophetic word in that it brings into view in grand outlines a future which it cannot and will not describe with verbal definiteness. Yet a progress consonant to nature is to be observed in the gradations of the curse, which one might enjoy as a physiological picture of development.

"If we suppose that one may speak of the Divine government or word blamelessly if the section before us is invested with a less mysterious aspect, we overlook the fact that the course of things immanent in life remains the same although the prophetic character of the word be set aside; that the chapters of calamity remain the same although one seek to erase the superscription from the punishment and from the judgment. Strange that one should think the world will thereupon cheer up when he traces back the dark destiny of a people to a gloomy fate, instead of to the justice of the living God. It is the very nobility of apostate Israel that its Jehovah is, and has been, jealous with such burning jealousy over its fall; and it would even seem worthy of contempt if it were considered as the football of a gloomy destiny—its sorrows without reason, without proportion, and without purpose. Certainly also the continuing motive for the rejection of Israel itself is its ill-will-against Jehovah, or indeed against the Gentiles, in return for which it must acknowledge in its history its well deserved visitation. . . . .

"That the bearing of God towards Israel was an impartial bearing, which could only be obscured through the idea of a national God, is proved even by our section with its threatenings in presence of the development of the history of Israel itself: they have been brought out of Egypt, and Canaan must become their land; but when they apostatize, they must lose Canaan and must be scattered among the heathen (Keil, p. 169 [Trans. p. 468]). Not only the impartiality indeed, but the jealousy of Jehovah must be made manifest in this. The idea or key of the whole history and destiny of Israel is: vengeance of the covenant. The people could fall so low because they stood so high, because they were the first-fruits, the first-born son, the favorite of God (Jeshurun). But for this reason especially the promise of their restoration is bound up with the prophecy of their curse (Isa., Jer., Ezek., Hos., *etc.*, Rom. xi). Knobel gives prominence to the peculiarly elevated language of this section; it cannot be explained by the ordinary mechanicism of 'Elohistic and Jehovistic documents.'"

This chapter forms a part of the same Divine communication with the preceding one.

Vers. 1, 2. These verses include substantially the first table of the decalogue, and by this short summary the whole duty of the Israelites toward God is called to mind and made the basis of the following promises and warnings. On ver. 1 see the Textual Notes. Ver. 2 is a repetition *verbatim* of xix. 30. Here, at least, it must be understood to include the whole of the "appointed seasons" as well as the weekly Sabbaths.

A. The Blessing. Vers. 3–13.

With ver. 3 a new *Parashah* of the law begins, extending to the close of Leviticus. The parallel proper lesson from the prophets is Jer. xvi. 19—xvii. 14. "The subject here is not the isolated good conduct of individuals, but the keeping of the Covenant of the people as a whole and its general tendency to blessing; the contrast to which, the breach of the Covenant, is moulded into the tendency to curse." Lange.

Ver. 4. Lange: "Rain in its season appears here as the first gift of Jehovah. When He gives

the rain from heaven, the earth gives its produce and the fruit-trees give their fruit; there is formed a chain of gifts whose beginning lies in the mysterious hand of God. "The allusion here is to the showers which fall at the two rainy seasons, and upon which the fruitfulness of Palestine depends, *viz.*, the early and latter rain (Deut. xi. 14). The former of these occurs after the autumnal equinox, at the time of the winter-sowing of wheat and barley, in the latter half of October or beginning of November. It generally falls in heavy showers in Nov. and Dec., and then after that only at long intervals, and not so heavily. The latter, or so-called latter rain, falls in March before the beginning of the harvest of the winter crops, at the time of the sowing of the summer seed, and lasts only a few days, in some years only a few hours (see Robinson, *Pal.* ii., pp. 97 sqq.)." Keil. [Also Robinson, *Phys. Geog. of the H. L.*, p. 263.] "In consequence of these rains the land should yield so rich an increase that **your threshing shall reach unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the sowing time** (for the next year). [Ver. 5. Comp. Amos ix. 13.]

"Vers. 6-8. The second yet higher gift of blessing is peace in the land, and that in relation to wild beasts" [חַיָּה רָעָה, an *evil animal*, for a beast of prey, as in Gen. xxxvii. 20. Keil] "as well as to war; therefore they **shall lie down** as a herd which no beast of prey and no robber shall affright. Yet more: **neither shall the sword go through your land**, because they should drive back triumphantly from their borders the enemies who should make any attack. The aggressor should fall by the sword upon the border." On the language in ver. 6 comp. Job xi. 19; Ps. cxlvii. 14; Ezek. xxxiv. 25-28. Ver. 8 is "a proverbial mode of expression for superiority in warlike prowess." Comp. Deut. xxxii. 30; Josh. xxiii. 10; Isa. xxx. 17.

Vers. 9, 10. Lange: "The third blessing is fruitfulness: increase upon increase of the people, and the strengthening of the Covenant under the special support of Jehovah." The multiplication of the people was a part of the covenant promise (Gen. xvii. 4-6), and its fulfillment established the covenant (*ib.* 7); not merely preserved it, but became the means by which it should be extended ever farther and farther. In view of this increase the promise of ver. 10 becomes more emphatic: so far from a dearth being caused by the multitude, the new store should be reached before the old could be consumed. This constitutes the fourth particular of the blessing.

Vers. 11-13. Lange: "The fifth blessing is the highest: the flower of their religion and religiousness. Jehovah will establish His dwelling (His living habitation) among them.—**And I will walk among you**, *etc.*—This promise touches typically even upon the height of the Christological incarnation. Jno. i. 14." [As this whole chapter has in view their residence in Canaan, so this promise in particular does not refer to God's leading His people in their wanderings, but to His continual manifestation of Himself in their midst in their settled home.—F. G.] "For these promises, spiritually and dynamically understood, Jehovah, the personal God of Israel, makes Himself security; and He has given them their deliverance from Egypt as a proof and pledge. They shall not become the slaves of men through distress, but shall stand upright as the servants of God." That is, the yoke of bondage which bowed down their heads as beasts of burden had been broken, and God had made them in consequence walk upright.

B. The Curse. Vers. 14–33.

Vers. 14, 15. Lange: "The breach of the Covenant. He begins with the external contempt of the ordinances of the covenant, and goes on to the internal scorn and rejection of the covenant law, a transgression therefore of the commands in their totality." This is carefully to be borne in mind in regard to these warnings. These "judgments are threatened, not for single breaches of the law, but for contempt of all the laws, amounting to inward contempt of the Divine commandments and a breach of the covenant (vers. 14, 15)—for presumptuous and obstinate rebellion, therefore, against God and His commandments." Keil. Single sins, or sins of individuals, are not the subject, but the general apostasy of the nation.

Vers. 16, 17, contain what Lange describes as "the punishment in the first grade;" it is the warning of visitation upon apostasy alone before it has become complicated with the added guilt of obdurate persistency. Three punishments are mentioned which are to be sent together, and not singly as they were offered to the choice of David after his sin in numbering the people (2 Sam. xxiv. 12-14)—disease, famine and defeat. It is easy to see how all these might (and historically did) come upon Israel as a natural consequence of their neglect of the Divine law; but they were none the less judgments of Him who had commanded that law and ordained that nature itself should protect it. Lange justly says: "One must not overlook the spirit of the Divine action; it is called **visitation** (ver. 16), and henceforth this is the principal thought and purpose which pervades all the punishments. It is also of a deeper meaning here that Jehovah will set His face against them; for their enemies are His instruments, and they will be smitten." Comp. Ezek. xxxiii. 27-29.

Vers. 18-20. According to Lange, "the punishment in the second grade," or the first of the more severe measures to be visited upon obdurate disobedience. Here, and in each of the three remaining stages (vers. 18, 21, 24, 28), the expression **seven times** is used. It is at once the number of perfection, indicating the full strength of the visitation, and also the sabbatical number, reminding the people of the broken covenant. Comp. Gen. iv. 15, 24; Ps. lxxix. 12; Prov. xxiv. 16; Luke xvii. 4. "There are five degrees in the ever seven times more severe punishment. God punishes so, that He always in wrath remembers mercy, and gives time for repentance. But no punishment is so great that a greater cannot follow it." Von Gerlach.

Vers. 21, 22. Lange: "The punishment in the third grade. The godlessness becomes ag-

gressive; they walk inimically towards Jehovah, the apostasy advances to bolder idolatry and contempt of God. But meanwhile, Jehovah yet stands still, and only sends against them the forerunners of His vengeance: ravaging beasts —a symptom of falling into decay: robbers of children, calamities among live stock, depopulation, desolated highways. The beasts may here be understood not merely literally." Comp. Judg. v. 6; Isa. xxxiii. 8; Ezek. v. 17; xiv. 15. "חָלַךְ קֶרִי עִם (*to go to a meeting with a person, i. e.*, to meet a person in a hostile manner, to fight against him) only occurs here in vers. 21 and 23, and is strengthened in vers. 24, 27, 28, 40, 41, into חָלַךְ בְּקֶרִי עִם, to engage in a hostile encounter with a person." Keil.

Vers. 23-26. Lange: "The punishment in the fourth grade. Now Jehovah also becomes aggressive and acts inimically towards them, as if He would destroy them. Now the breach of the covenant is decided, and the sword comes over them as the avenger of the covenant. Picturesque delineation of the three dark riders, Rev. vi., only that here the plague goes before the famine." The idea of the text is clearly that by the inroads of the enemy Israel would be shut up in their cities, and while besieged there, would be visited with pestilence and famine. Such calamities were repeatedly experienced, 2 Kings vi. 24-29, *etc.* Comp. Isa. iii. 1; Jer. xiv. 18; Ezek. iv. 16; v. 12, and especially the story of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. To *break the staff of bread* is a frequent proverbial expression for the infliction of extreme scarcity. One oven should suffice for the bread of families ordinarily baked in ten, and in its scarcity it should be dealt out by weight.

Vers. 27-33. Lange: "The punishment in the fifth grade. Now Jehovah moves against them verily in fury, and the last catastrophes follow: despair even to madness; the eating of their own children (Knobel, Keil, and the Jewish history) [comp. Deut. xxviii. 53; 2 Kings vi. 28, 29; Jer. xiv. 12; Lam. ii. 20; iv. 10; Ezek. v. 10. Also Jos. *Bel. Jud.* v. 10, 3.—F. G.]; overthrow of their idolatrous cultus, in the sarcastic conception that the dead bodies of men fall down on the mock dead bodies of their idols, carcases upon carcases" [comp. 2 Kings xxiii. 16; Ezek. vi. 4. The **high places** refer to places of idolatrous worship as in use among the Canaanites and most other nations, and which must have been already sufficiently familiar to Moses and his people.—F. G.]; "overthrow of even the real historical sanctuary; repudiation of the sacrificial cultus, ver. 31" [comp. 2 Kings xxv. 9; Ps. lxxiv. 6, 7]; "desolation of the land, so that even the enemies settling therein recognize the dismal footprints of punitive justice, deportations of the people (one after another, comp. the Jewish history from Alexander to Hadrian)." Comp. Jer. ix. 16-22; xviii. 16; xix. 8; Ezek. v. Also Deut. iv. 27, 28; xxviii. 37, 64-68.

Effects of these Visitations. Vers. 34–39.

Vers. 34, 35, express the restorative effect accomplished by the punishment itself. The land must needs enjoy its Sabbaths while it lay desolate. In regard to the kingdom of Judah, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21 expressly fixes the length of the Babylonish captivity with reference to the number of unobserved Sabbatical years. These constituted *the Sabbaths of the land*, the weekly Sabbath of one day being too brief for effect upon the soil. Vers. 36-39 describe in fearful terms the effect of the Divine visitation upon the remnant who should escape immediate destruction. On the language of ver. 38 comp. Num. xiii. 32; Ezek. xxxvi. 13.

C. The Restoration of the Covenant.
Vers. 40–45.

Lange: "The first thing is the acknowledgment and confession of guilt. But the repentance would be thorough only in case the misdeeds of the fathers were acknowledged along with their own misdeeds, see Ps. li. The view that Jehovah has interposed, contending against them because they contended against Him, is the second thing, ver. 41.—(Repeated declaration in regard to the cause of the punishments.) The humiliation under the judgment of their having an uncircumcised heart, *i. e.*, of their being heathen in a spiritual sense, is the third. Yes, they come now to bless the punishments of their misdeeds, to rejoice over them, since God has visited them in this manner (יִרְצוּ). Keil accepts the translation of the LXX. *εὐδοκήσουσιν τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν*, "they will take pleasure, rejoice in their misdeeds, *i. e.*, in the consequences and results of them." We hold with Luther to the idea of עָוֹן (see Gesen.) as sufficient punishment; the paradox itself *O felix culpa* could not be translated: they have pleasure in their misdeeds. But to salute the cross is a proof in action of a deeper religiousness, which here already germinates." [See, however, Textual Note 24.—F. G.]

"Ver. 41. In a religious sense the divine pardon is the cause, in a moral sense the consequence of the repentance of the people; the remembrance of the Covenant with Jacob and Isaac and Abraham, *i. e.* an ever-deepening, inward remembrance of the old love, appears to awake in Jehovah, for it does awake in the consciousness of the people. The holy land itself, which cannot be forgotten and is kindly, receives now a peculiarly affecting form. The land whose mourning is changed to feasts, and the people whose penitence is changed to feasts, accord so affectingly with Jehovah, that, so to speak, He reveals Himself again as justifying: **because, even because they despised my judgments, and because their soul abhorred my statutes. And yet for all that**— their pardon is approaching: *viz.* the restoration, and that truly entirely according to the analogy of the restoration from the land of Egypt. That this promise is effective for the nation of Israel, but is not to be understood of the spiritual Israel as such, needs no argument. At the close again, אֲנִי יְהוָה." [The promise of mercy upon Israel when they should repent and turn to the Lord, was certainly a promise to the covenant people, and was repeatedly fulfilled in their history, especially in the restoration from the captivity

of Babylon. But the promise (Jer. xxxi. 31-34) was that in the days to come God would make a new covenant with His people of a more spiritual character, and in the Ep. to the Heb (viii. 10-12; x. 15-18) we are told that this has been accomplished in the Christian Church springing from the bosom of the Jewish. The continued faithfulness of God to His people according to the promises of this section, must therefore be now looked for after a Christian and spiritual, rather than a Jewish and temporal fashion.—F. G.]

"And thus it is conformable to the truth of a personal God that He should attach the utmost importance to afflicting the personal life of His people, and then reanimating it again. If it is said: What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? so is it likewise said: What shall it harm a man, if he shall lose the whole world, and his soul thereby be delivered? Would a philosophy in opposition to this, which has sunk the personal life in impersonal things, be a higher wisdom?

"It is to be understood that the principles of this Divine government over Israel apply, according to their modifications, to His government over every nation."

At the beginning of this chapter Lange says: "It cannot be concluded from ver. 46 that Leviticus should properly end with this section; ver. 46 much rather looks back to ver. 3, and makes it clear that the subject here is the Covenant bond between Jehovah and the people of Israel." Ver. 46 undoubtedly looks back immediately to xxv. 1, the beginning of the Divine communication of which this is the end; but as it also forms the close of ch. xxvi., so we cannot but regard this chapter itself as closing the Book of Leviticus proper. The analogy of this with other portions of the law has already been pointed out, and the reasons for regarding ch. xxvii. as an appendix will be mentioned in the treatment of that chapter.

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. The warnings and promises of this chapter show it was foreseen that much of the Mosaic legislation was likely to be neglected by the people. Nevertheless God gave it. The same is true of much of Christian duty, both in regard to definite observances as baptism and the Lord's Supper, and still more in regard to the standard of Christian life and character. But because man does not come up to its requirements, the law is not thereby foiled of its purpose; its requirements were not lowered to the level of human weakness and sinfulness, but rather designed to set forth so much of the Divine holiness and purity as would be instrumental in raising man to a higher level. "It was not like the legislation of ordinary states, intended primarily to meet the exigencies of existing facts and to keep offenders in order. Its purpose was to help and instruct the best of the people, not merely to chastise the worst. Other legislators have taken their starting points from human facts: Moses took his from the character and purpose of God." Clark. And in this, to the thoughtful man, is a really powerful evidence of the Divine authorship of the legislation.

II. In vers. 39, 40, **the iniquity of their fathers** is made a part of the sin for which the people were to suffer, and on the confession of which they were to be forgiven. As this is God's revealed word, so does all history show that it is in accordance with His government of nature that in nations, as in individuals, the sins of the fathers are visited upon the children; but all this is nevertheless under the law that the sincere repentance of the children shall avert from them the punishment of their forefathers' sins as well as of their own.

III. Illustrative of ver. 41 is 2 Cor. vii. 10 and Heb. xii. 11. The punishments of God leading to repentance, however grievous they may seem, are yet truly occasions of rejoicing in view of their higher object.

IV. In ver. 46 the covenant legislation of Mt. Sinai is expressly said to have been given **by the hand of Moses.** This fact is sufficiently patent throughout the whole story of the legislation; but its emphatic mention here has a double use: first, in showing that this book *claims* a contemporary origin; and second, in bringing out the fact of the necessity of a mediator between man and God. If Moses was only a human mediator, especially strengthened and authorized for this purpose; yet he points forward typically to the one true Mediator from whom alone man may know the will of God, and through whom alone he may draw near to His inapproachable majesty.

V. Although it is abundantly evident from the warnings of this chapter that man is unable so to keep God's commandments as to claim any reward as of merit; yet it is also clear from its promises, and especially from these as contrasted with the warnings, that He does look with favor upon and will bless and reward the honest effort to do His will. These things are spoken of Israel as a nation, and are true of all nations in all time; but nations are made up of individuals, and the principles of the Divine bearing towards man are as true of the component elements as of the mass in its totality.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "The great contrast of blessing and of curse which lies in the law—which the law strengthens. The law speaks not only of curse, as many imagine; it speaks also of blessing. For it is one thing to be occupied with the works of the law and to seek righteousness through the law and by means of works (according to Gal. iii. 10 sqq.), and another thing to stand under the law in the true fear of God, and to strive after its righteousness until one comes to the righteousness which is of faith (according to Rom. vii.). The law of Jehovah ever stands under the protection of the Lawgiver. It is the rule of His power; it is the spirit of the world's history; it is the voice of conscience (Rom. ii.), and the disposition of the heart. The blessings of fidelity to the law: the piety of a people, the fruitfulness of the land, peace, victory, *etc.*, *etc.* (xxvi. 1 sqq.). The fearful gradations of the curse. Particular blessings. Particular curses. The final promise of the restoration of Israel out of the state

of the curse. Jehovah will remember His covenant for all those who reform themselves."

"There is a marvellous and grand display of the greatness of God in the fact, that He holds out before the people, whom He has just delivered from the hands of the heathen and gathered round Himself, the prospect of being scattered again among the heathen, and that, even before the land is taken by the Israelites, He predicts its return to desolation. These words could only be spoken by One who has the future really before His mind, who sees through the whole depth of sin, and who can destroy His own work, and yet attain His end. But so much the more adorable and marvellous is the grace, which nevertheless begins its work among such sinners, and is certain of victory notwithstanding all retarding and opposing influences." Auberlen.

God promises in vers. 11, 12, that He will set His tabernacle and will walk among His people —a typical promise, fulfilled in Christ who *tabernacled* in us (John i. 14), and through whom we become Temples of God the Holy Ghost (1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19), and God will "tabernacle for ever" with us (Rev. vii. 15; xxi. 3). Wordsworth.

Origen deduces from this chapter a commentary on 2 Timothy ii. 5: "If a man strive for masteries, yet is he not crowned except he strive lawfully." Our efforts to obtain God's blessing, our hope of avoiding His wrath, must be in the way of His commandment. We can only please Him by seeking to do His will, and He has made it known to us.

There is ever a due relation between the temporal and the spiritual, and these promises show that the rewards held out before the Israelites were of a spiritual as well as a temporal character; so it is to be remembered that along with the more spiritual rewards of the Christian religion, it has the "promise of the life that now is," as well as of that which is to come. Calvin.

APPENDIX.

Of Vows.

CHAP. XXVII. 1–34.

1, 2 AND the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When a man shall make a singular vow, the persons *shall be* for the LORD by thy estimation [special[1] vow, the souls *shall be* to the LORD according 3 to an[2] estimation]. And thy[2] estimation shall be of the male from twenty years old even unto sixty years old, even thy[2] estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, 4 after the shekel of the sanctuary. And if it *be* a female, then thy[2] estimation shall 5 be thirty shekels. And if *it be* from five years old even unto twenty years old, then thy[2] estimation shall be of the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels. 6 And if *it be* for a month old even unto five years old, then thy[2] estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver, and for the female thy[2] estimation *shall be* three 7 shekels of silver. And if *it be* from sixty years old and above; if *it be* a male, 8 then thy[2] estimation shall be fifteen shekels, and for the female ten shekels. But if he be poorer than thy[2] [be too poor *to pay* the[2]] estimation, then he shall present himself before the priest, and the priest shall value him: according to his ability that vowed shall the priest value him.

9 ¦ And if *it be* a beast, whereof men bring an offering unto the LORD, all that *any* 10 *man* giveth of such unto the LORD shall be holy. He shall not alter it, nor change it, a good for a bad, or a bad for a good: and if he shall at all change beast for 11 beast, then it and the exchange thereof shall be holy. And if *it be* any unclean beast, of which they do not offer a sacrifice [an offering[3]] unto the LORD, then he

TEXTUAL AND GRAMMATICAL.

[1] Ver. 2. "הַפְלִיא נֶדֶר does not mean to dedicate or set apart a vow, but to make a special vow." Keil.

[2] Vers. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, *etc.* "The second כ in בְּעֶרְכֶּךָ is formative of the noun, by reduplication of the third radical: it is not the pronominal suffix." Horsley. "The Heb. subst. עֵרֶךְ, *estimation* or *value*, is never found in Scripture, but with the pronoun of the second person joined to it; and which is an *expletive*, having no use but to distinguish it from the meaning of an ordinance, or laying in order." Delgado. According to Fürst "the *suff.* refers to the person valued." The LXX., Onk., Vulg. and Syr. omit the pronoun altogether.

[3] Ver. 11. קָרְבָּן. See Textual Note [2] on ii. 1.

12 shall present the beast before the priest: and the priest shall value [estimate[4]] it,
whether it be good or bad: as thou valuest it, *who art* the priest [according to the[2]
13 estimation[4] of the priest], so shall it be. But if he will at all redeem it, then he
shall add a fifth *part* thereof unto thy[2] estimation.
14 And when a man shall sanctify his house *to be* holy unto the LORD, then the
priest shall estimate it, whether it be good or bad: as the priest shall estimate it,
15 so shall it stand. And if he that sanctified it will redeem his house, then he shall
add the fifth *part* of the money of thy[2] estimation unto it, and it shall be his.
16 And if a man shall sanctify unto the LORD *some part* of a field of his possession
[inheritance[5]], then thy[2] estimation shall be according to the seed thereof: an homer
17 of barley seed *shall be valued* at fifty shekels of silver. [6]If he sanctify his field from
18 the year of jubile, according to thy[2] estimation it shall stand. But if he sanctify
his field after the jubile, then the priest shall reckon unto him the money according
to the years that remain, even unto the year of the jubile, and it shall be abated
19 from thy[2] estimation. And if he that sanctified the field will in any wise redeem
it, then he shall add the fifth *part* of the money of thy[2] estimation unto it, and it
20 shall be assured to him. And if he will not redeem the field, or if he have sold the
21 field to another man, it shall not be redeemed any more. But the field, when it
goeth out in the jubile, shall be holy unto the LORD, as a field devoted; the pos-
22 session [inheritance[5]] thereof shall be the priest's. And if *a man* sanctify unto the
LORD a field which he hath bought, which *is* not of the fields of his possession
23 [inheritance[5]]; then the priest shall reckon unto him the worth of thy[2] estimation,
even unto the year of the jubile: and he shall give thine[2] estimation in that day,
24 *as* a holy thing unto the LORD. In the year of the jubile the field shall return
unto him of whom it was bought, *even* to him to whom the possession [inheritance[5]]
of the land *did belong.*
25 And all thy[2] estimations shall be according to the shekel of the sanctuary:
twenty gerahs shall be the shekel.
26 Only the firstling of the beasts, which should be the LORD'S firstling, no man
shall sanctify it; whether *it be* ox, or sheep [one of the flock[7]], it *is* the LORD'S.
27 And if *it be* of an unclean beast, then he shall redeem [free[8]] *it* according to thine[2]
estimation, and shall add a fifth *part* of it thereto: or if it be not redeemed, then it
shall be sold according to thy[2] estimation.
28 Notwithstanding no devoted thing, that a man shall devote unto the LORD of
all that he hath, *both* of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be
29 sold or redeemed: every devoted thing *is* most holy unto the LORD. None devoted,
which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed [freed[8]], *but* shall surely be put
to death.
30 And all the tithe of the land, *whether* of the seed of the land, *or* of the fruit of
31 the tree, *is* the LORD'S: *it is* holy unto the LORD. And if a man will at all redeem
ought of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth *part* thereof.
32 And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, *even* of whatsoever passeth
33 under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the LORD. He shall not search whe-
ther it be good or bad, neither shall he change it: and if he change it at all, then
both it and the change thereof shall be holy; it shall not be redeemed.
34 These *are* the commandments, which the LORD commanded Moses for the chil-
dren of Israel in mount Sinai.

[4] Ver. 12. *Valuation* is quite as good a translation of עֶרְכְּךָ; but as the A. V. has *estimation* in all other places in this chapter, it should be retained here.

[5] Ver. 16. אֲחֻזָּתוֹ=*possession* here means *possession by inheritance*, and it is better to mark this in the translation as purchased fields (ver. 22) come under another law.

[6] Ver. 17. A conjunction is here supplied by the Sam., 16 MSS., the LXX., Chald. and Syr.

[7] Ver. 26. שֶׂה. See Textual Note [6] on xii. 8.

[8] Vers. 27, 29. וּפָדְרָה=*free* or *deliver*. It is a different word from the גָּאַל of the second clause of ver. 27 and of both clauses of ver. 20, and should be differently translated.

EXEGETICAL AND CRITICAL.

The question of the relation of this chapter to the rest of the book is partly a matter of form, and partly to be determined by the contents. As to the former, the preceding chapter of promises and warnings is an appropriate close of the legislation, and its last verse certainly has the air of the subscription to a finished work. The present chapter also closes with an abbreviated form of the same subscription. It may be compared to the close of John xx., after which ch. xxi. follows plainly as an addition. As to the subject matter: our chapter is very clearly distinguished from the rest of the book in that it treats of special voluntary consecrations to the Lord; and yet it is connected with the foregoing, in that these also are to be brought under the same general law of sacred fidelity. The chapter therefore constitutes precisely what is understood by an *appendix*, appropriate to the book. Lange's objection to this seems based upon a different idea of the word, and his arguments go to show only that it is appropriate. He says, "1. With our section corresponds Num. vi.; xxx.; Deut. xxiii. 21; Judges xi. 35 [34–40]; Eccl. v. 5. According to Keil this section should be an appendix—contrary to the declaration at the close of ver. 34. He gives as his reason: "The directions concerning vows follow the express termination of the Sinaitic law-giving (xxvi. 46), as an appendix to it, because vows formed no integral part of the covenant laws, but were a freewill expression of piety common to almost all nations, and belonged to the modes of worship current in all religions, which were not demanded, and might be omitted altogether, and which really lay outside the law, though it was necessary to bring them into harmony with the demands of the law upon Israel." According to this apprehension, however, much of the Mosaic legislation must stand in an appendix; indeed, it may be said of the sacrifices, that they are the theocratic regulation of a primeval sacrificial custom, and not originally theocratically commanded. We accept then the view that the prescriptions of this section are attached to the foregoing chapter as a law of keeping the covenant in particulars, *viz.* in relation to the pledged word, or as a law of particular and individual duties under the law of keeping the covenant as a whole." [We cannot see that this could be better defined than by the word *Appendix*.—F. G.] "The superscription of this section 'Of vows' is not truly congruous with the whole. The unity is: of special consecrations, or of the keeping holy of special covenant duties in relation to their remissibleness or their irremissibility, and indeed 1) of voluntary and remissible vows or consecrations, vers. 1-27; 2) of the extraordinary, but commanded and irremissible consecration, or of the ban, vers. 28, 29; 3) of the consecrated holy first-fruits, or of the tithes, partly redeemable and partly unredeemable. Vers. 30–33 (34).

2. "The religious fundamental thought of the section. Cursorily considered, it appears a kind of regulation for the remissible and irremissible special duties of the covenant, and in particular it assumes the external character of a tax; the ideal germ of the whole, however, is again the keeping holy of the personal life in relation to the personal Jehovah, the manliness of individual piety; one might say: the keeping pure of the religious vow, of the word given to God; the Divine ordinance of the ban; the holy fruit-tax which is appointed for the maintenance of the priests and Levites in the same way as the temple-tax for the support of the temple and the sacrifice. . . . .

"3. The vows. On the meaning and the nature itself, comp. the lexicons, especially both the articles in Herzog's *Real-encyklopädie*. Writings on this subject of Weise and others." [See also the archæologies, Art. *vows* in Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, and important observations scattered in Michaelis' *laws*, Art. 73, 83, 124, 145.—F. G.]. "We distinguish promissory vows and vows of renunciation, ... so that it may be not without meaning that the vows are spoken of here, as efficient Levitical consecrations; the renunciations, or Nazarite vows, on the other hand, in the book of Numbers, the book of the social relations of the commonwealth. Samson was qualified as a Nazarite for a theocratico-political action; Paul's Nazarite vow also was devoted to ecclesiastical politics (Acts xxi.); and James the Just had consecrated himself as a Nazarite to the deliverance of his nation. The religious vows, as such, form a parallel to the peace offerings and partly indeed were connected with them. The ethics of the Old Testament vows consists in this: first, that they are not commanded but voluntary, Deut. xxiii. 22-24 (consequently not the object of the mediæval so-called *consilia evangelica*); and secondly, that as a pledged word they must be held inviolable (Prov. xx. 25; Eccl. v. 3, 5), yet not literally, since equivalents for their discharge were legally prescribed; thirdly, that the neglect of their fulfilment is to be expiated with a sin offering (v. 4-6). The vows were formal promises given to God for the benefit of the Sanctuary; they had for their object not only cattle, houses, and lands, but also persons, of course, dependent children and slaves. The examples of Jacob (Gen. xxxv. 14) and others, show how significantly the vows of the Old Testament operated. The superstitious misinterpretation of the vow of Jephthah, according to the corrections of Hengstenberg, P. Cassel, and others previously, appears yet capable of being held tolerably righteous. It is indeed one of the exegetical prejudices in which, from different motives, literal orthodoxy and negative criticism come together." [The question of the actual sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter has always divided opinion in ancient as well as modern times. Jewish tradition is decided for the actual sacrifice as an unrighteous act. There are several reasons why it is not likely to have taken place: no priest could have been found to offer it; nor could it possibly have received the Divine acceptance; and it is contrary to the most probable interpretation of the closing verses of the story (Judg. xi. 37-40). Moreover it is unlikely that Jephthah would have committed such an act when he was not bound to it by his vow; the vow was an alternative one,—that he would dedicate what met him to the Lord, or offer it as a

sacrifice. That this is the true sense of ו and not AND, as in the A. V., is plain, for even the most rash of men must have remembered the great improbability that the first thing he met on his return would be either one "of the flock of the herd," or a pigeon, the only animals admissible in sacrifice. There is therefore in the execution of the vow of Jephthah no just ground for the absurd charge of the allowance of human sacrifices among the Israelites.—F. G.]. "There is no question that the vows, on account of their legal character, belong more to the Old than to the New Testament; although they still have their place in the New Testament time also, but certainly not in the sense of the mediæval, avaricious priesthood."

The general principle on the subject of vows is clearly laid down in Deut. xxiii. 21-24: they were not obligatory, and no sin was incurred by not making them; but once made they were to be conscientiously kept, and their neglect (ch. v. 4-6) required the expiation of the sin offering. It appears from this chapter that nothing could be made the subject of a vow which was already marked out by the law as belonging to God; but anything else might be, and having been vowed, might be redeemed, with the exception of the sacrificial animals, and except also things or persons devoted, vers. 28, 29. The subject of this chapter is the ordinary vow, and has no reference to the vow of the Nazarite, Num. vi. 1-21. The exceptional conditions under which the vow was not binding are detailed in Num. xxx.

Vers. 1–25. regulate the commutation of vows; vers. 28, 29 declare the incommutability of things devoted; vers. 30-33 declare what tithes and under what conditions may be commuted: while ver. 34 closes the whole. Under the first head, vers. 2-8 relate to the commutation of persons; 9-13, of cattle; 14, 15, of houses; 16-25, of land.

Vers. 2–8. Lange: "According to Knobel the consecration of persons means that one allots himself, or another of whom he has the disposal, to the service of the Sanctuary. He cites as examples the consecration of Samuel, the Gibeonites, the augmentation of the temple slaves by David and Solomon, Ezra ii. 58; viii. 20; Neh. vii. 60; xi. 3 (p. 583). Keil, on the other hand, asserts that in every vow of a person redemption must take place according to the value, with reference to the Mishna (see p. 179). [Trans. p. 480 and note. Keil also cites Saalschutz, and thinks Oehler wrong in referring to 1 Sam. ii. 11, 22, 28, in proof of the opposite view.—F. G.]. "But the appointed valuation little accords with this. It is inconceivable why in this case old men and old women should have been redeemed at a smaller cost than men and women in their vigor. Keil himself makes prominent that the valuation was conformed to the vitality and skill. Besides the diversity of the valuation, it was entrusted to the priest to value a poor man less, from which it does not follow that he *must* be redeemed, but only that he *might* be. The fact that children under five years of age could not be consecrated, points also to the ability to serve." In regard to the difference of valuation, Lange's argument does not seem to be a determining one; on either theory the valuation would naturally be based upon what might be called the actual *worth* of the person; but there would be no object in a valuation at all except for the purpose of redemption, and it is expressly provided that all persons who had been vowed must be valued. The diminished valuation of a poor man was a merciful provision analogous to the alternate sin offering in case of poverty. Notwithstanding Lange's view, it seems to point very strongly to the universality of redemption; otherwise there would be no reason why the poor man should not have worked out his vow, or why he should have been redeemed at a lower rate than others whose services were of the same intrinsic value. In saying "that children under five years could not be consecrated," Lange must have overlooked ver. 6, which expressly provides a valuation for those vowed from one month to five years. The form of expression in ver. 2, moreover, seems to contemplate redemption in all cases of personal vows. The objection to this view is that a personal vow thereby becomes only a roundabout and awkward way of consecrating the amount of the redemption money to the Lord; but the moral effect appears to have been different, and with the personal vow there is to be supposed a sense of spiritual consecration to God which was not removed by the payment of the redemption. Kalisch speaks very strongly: "To our author vowing a person to God meant neither offering him up as a sacrifice, nor dedicating him to the service of the temple, and much less selling him as a slave, but simply redeeming him by money in favor of the sacred treasury; so foreign were the two former alternatives to his mind, that he utterly ignored them, and stated the third as a matter of course, and the only one to be considered."

Vers. 9–13. Vows of animals. The right of redemption in this case depended upon the nature of the animal; if it was one suitable for sacrifice (vers. 9, 10), after being once vowed, it could not be redeemed or exchanged, and the result of an attempt at exchange was that both animals should belong to the Lord. It does not follow that the animals were to be immediately sacrificed, but they may have been put into the herd from which the public sacrifices were taken. The case of animals of the sacrificial kinds, with blemishes which unfitted them for the altar, is not especially mentioned; but after the analogy of ver. 33, these probably went to the support of the priests. If, on the other hand, the animal was unclean (vers. 11-13), it must be valued by the priest; then it might be redeemed by adding one-fifth to its value, or else it belonged to the sanctuary. Keil thinks it was then sold for the benefit of the sanctuary; but in this case the original owner would have had no occasion to redeem it at a higher price since he could have bought it at its estimated value. It is more likely therefore that such animals were retained, at least for a time, for the use of the priests and Levites. Keil considers that the Heb. בֵּין . . . וּבֵין means "'between good and bad,' *i. e.*, neither very high as if it were very good, nor very low as if it were bad, but at a medium price." The A. V., however, is in accordance with the ancient versions, and is sustained by Gesenius.

Vers. 14, 15. The law for houses is the same

as for unclean animals. It relates probably only to houses in the cities, as those in the country would come under the following law for land.

Vers. 16–24. Lange: "Lands, a. Inheritances. If they were not redeemed they lapsed in the year of Jubilee to the Sanctuary. If they were redeemed, the price was determined partly according to the money value of the seed for the land, partly according to the number of sowings or seed years to the Jubilee year, and a fifth part of the amount must be added besides. These ordinances applied also to the purchaser (the under tenant). A field was taken for the measure of valuation which yielded until the year of Jubilee one Homer (225 pounds, or two bushels of seed)." [The expression (ver. 16) **according to the seed thereof** is generally understood to mean, according to the seed required to sow it; but the difference is immaterial; it is merely an expression of the measure of valuation, and the proportion will remain the same whatever it be. The value of the homer of barley, however (estimated by Thenius at 225 pounds), is so great, amounting probably to about twenty-seven dollars, that it is necessary to understand it, as Lange has done, not of the single *homer*, but of a *homer* annually during the forty-two years (omitting the seven Sabbatical years) intervening between two Jubilee years. This would make the money value of the single homer of barley about 64 cts.; but it is to be remembered that on the average it was to be paid many years in advance, so that we cannot estimate from this the actual price of the barley. Others however (as Clarke and Keil) think it was an annual payment as it accrued. The meaning of the expression, ver. 20, **if he have sold the field to another man** is uncertain. According to Knobel it means "if he has fraudulently sold the field to another, and taken the price to himself, after having vowed it to the sanctuary." In this case the confiscation of the field to the Lord would be the penalty upon his trickery and deceit. Keil rejects this view, and supposes that the owner continued to cultivate the land himself, paying a yearly rent to the sanctuary; in such a case the basis of sale would be the possible surplus of the produce above the yearly rental, and the fault of the seller "consisted simply in the fact that he had looked upon the land which he vowed to the Lord as though it were his own property, still and entirely at his own disposal, and therefore had allowed himself to violate the rights of the Lord by the sale of his land." Wordsworth, following Jarchi, suggests another interpretation; that the pronoun *he* is used impersonally, and the expression means, if the field had been sold by the treasurer for the benefit of the sanctuary. The object would then be to make the title given by the sanctuary in all cases perfect. A simpler explanation is to understand **have sold** in a pluperfect sense= *had sold—viz.:* before making his vow. In this case he would have no claim upon it until after the Jubilee (except by redemption), and therefore his vow could only be accomplished by the land falling to the sanctuary at the Jubilee. The reason for the same result in case of refusal to redeem is apparently based upon the persistent wish of the owner. He might redeem at any time up to the Jubilee; and if he did not, he showed that he wished absolutely to give the field to the Lord. It does not appear that the landed possessions of the sanctuary ever grew large in this way.—F. G.]. "*b.* Purchased possessions. Since these must fall back in the Jubilee year to the heir, they could only become the subject of vows in a very limited sense." The vow of a purchased field *required* (ver. 23) the immediate payment of its full value (without addition) to the year of Jubilee. In this case the actual occupation and usufruct of the land undoubtedly remained with the one who had made the vow, subject to the ordinary law of redemption (xxv. 23–28). The requirement here of immediate payment does not imply that in the former case (ver. 19) the payment was annual (so Keil, Clark, and others), but only that here the money must be immediately paid down as the only security for its payment at all.

Ver. 25 simply provides that the standard of all valuations must be **the shekel of the sanctuary**—a silver coin estimated at 54 cents. It was divided into 20 gerahs of 2.7 cts. each. The LXX. uses the word δίδραχμα, which is employed in Matt. xvii. 24 for the *half*-shekel, the Alexandrian δραχμὴ being double the Attic.

Vers. 26, 27. The positive law concerning vows is now completed. It remains to treat negatively of certain things which were not allowed to become the subject of vows. First, all the first-born of animals are excluded as already belonging to the Lord, and therefore incapable of being given to Him either by vow or in any other way: **no man shall sanctify it.** A firstling **of an unclean beast**, however, might be redeemed by adding a fifth to its valuation—otherwise it was to be sold for the benefit of the sanctuary. The reason for its peremptory sale in this case, instead of its retention for use, was doubtless the tender age of the firstlings, so that if they were retained they must have occupied much time and care. Lange: "Keil remarks 'By this regulation the earlier law, which commanded that an ass should either be redeemed with a sheep or else be put to death (Ex. xiii. 13; xxxiv. 20) was modified in favor of the revenues of the sanctuary and its servants.' Comp. Winer, *etc.* We cannot consider this correct. Concerning the first-born of an unclean beast, the law was peremptory. And how should the law-giver here come back once more to the unclean beast? Nevertheless, a special ordinance concerning the first-born might certainly be met with which had dropped out through a defect under the law of unclean animals." Keil, Clark and others must have overlooked the fact that the law of Exodus is only a special law concerning the *ass*, but making no mention of other unclean animals; while here the law is a general one which, as often in general laws, does not mention the already known and established exception. It had been but a year since the law for the ass was first given in Exodus, and less than this since its repetition in Ex. xxxiv. 20. The time is too short, therefore, for the reason given by Keil and Clark for its modification.

Vers. 28, 29. From redeemable vows is also to be excepted every **devoted thing**, whether of man, or beast, or land. This is the first in-

stance of the use of the word חֵרֶם, and it occurs afterwards in the law but seldom (Num. xviii. 14; Deut. vii. 26, *bis;* xiii. 17). It is introduced as a term already familiar. It is translated by various words in the A. V. (as *curse, accursed, dedicated, devoted, appointed to utter destruction, etc.*), but etymologically and by usage always means irrevocably cut off from all common use—in the case of persons, devoted to destruction—in the case of things entirely surrendered to the Lord to be disposed of at His will. "What was devoted could never be offered in sacrifice; but in all places where mention is elsewhere made of the ban laid on any thing (Num. xviii. 14; xxxi.; Deut. ii. 34; xiii. 12-18; xxv. 19; Josh. vi. 17-19; Mal. iv. 6) this appears as a dedication to destruction, as a fulfilling of the Divine vengeance, as an honoring of God *on* those *in* whom He cannot show Himself holy and glorious." Von Gerlach. In regard to inanimate objects the meaning is therefore clear enough; but the expression **which shall be devoted of men** (ver. 29) has been the occasion of some difficulty. This much is certainly plain: that the sentence of *cherem* once pronounced was absolutely irrevocable, and in 1 Sam. xv. 21, 33, we have an instance of the prophet's indignant rebuke of the attempt to set it aside. Beyond this, the only instances of the *cherem* in Scripture are those which rested upon an express Divine command. Jephthah's vow does not come under this category at all, for that was a vow either to offer a burnt offering, or to devote to the Lord; but the *cherem* is not treated as a vow at all, and is separated from ordinary vows by being irredeemable. The general sense of the passage, historically interpreted, is therefore that man may not interfere to thwart the purpose of the Almighty: Jehovah's sentence of destruction must always be unflinchingly carried out. Ver. 28, however, clearly asserts that an individual man might **devote** persons belonging to him in the same way that he could his animals or fields, while ver. 29 requires that any one so devoted must be put to death. The meaning of this very mysterious provision must be gathered from the historical instances of the *cherem*. It could have applied only to the devoting of those who were already manifestly under the ban of Jehovah—those guilty of such outrageous and flagrant violation of the fundamental law of the covenant that they manifestly came under the penalty of death. Such persons, instead of being tried and condemned, might be at once **devoted** and put to death. Lange's exegesis is as follows: "That which had been placed under *the ban* was absolutely irredeemable. No object was banned, however, or consecrated to Jehovah by an irrevocable reversion (for the use of the Sanctuary in the case of impersonal things, or for death instead of capital punishment in the case of persons) through any private will; only Jehovah, or the community in His service, executed the ban. The various particulars of the ban are explained by Knobel, p. 588." See also Selden *de Jure Gent.* IV., vi.–xi.; Waterland *Scripture vindicated*, Works IV., p. 226–229.

Vers. 30–33. Tithes also are to be excluded from the possible subjects of vows, since they already belonged to the Lord; in certain cases, however, they might be redeemed like vows. The tithe, like the thing devoted, is referred to as something already familiar. From Abraham's tithe to Melchizedec (Gen. xiv. 20) and Jacob's vow (Gen. xxviii. 22), and probably from still far earlier times, it had been immemorially an essential part of the worship of God. The tithe is here spoken of, therefore, not for the purpose of enjoining it, but to exclude it from vows, and to prescribe how far and under what conditions, like vows, it might be redeemed. In Num. xviii. 20-32; Deut. xii. 6, 11; xiv. 22, directions are given as to the use and the collection of the tithes. "According to Rabbinical tradition, the animals to be tithed were enclosed in a pen, and as they went out, one by one at the opening, every tenth animal was touched with a rod dipped in vermilion. Comp. Jerem. xxxiii. 13; Ezek. xx. 37." Clark. The tithe was applied, of course, only to the *increase* of the flock and the herd, *i. e.*, to animals which had never been tithed before. Lange: "It must not be overlooked that the tithes were a ground-rent in favor of the hierarchy, primarily of the Levites, who again must themselves pay tithes to the priest; and were also a perpetual theocratic civil tax which could not properly be maintained in Christian times by the side of other taxes, notwithstanding the strong Old Testament disposition of the middle ages in this matter. It is easy to see that at the present day, by the side of the modern forms of voluntary and involuntary taxes, ecclesiastical and secular, tithes can only be claimed by an overstrained literal zeal." The law (32, 33) absolutely forbade the redemption or exchange of the tithe of sacrificial animals, as in case of a vow; other tithes were also under the same law as the vow, and might be redeemed by the payment of their value with one-fifth in addition.

Ver. 34 closes this appendix, and forms, as it were, a second close to the whole book of Leviticus, the aim and object of which has been *holiness*—holiness to be typically acquired by the sacrificial system prescribed to point to "the Lord our righteousness;" and to be preserved by those many legal enactments superadded to the great law of faith, "because of transgressions, until the promised seed should come."

DOCTRINAL AND ETHICAL.

I. In the law for the redemption of personal vows is again brought out very strongly the equality of all men before God. Differences were made according to sex and age, but none according to social position and rank. The redemption for the high-priest himself was precisely the same as for the day-laborer.

II. In the prohibition of vows of the first-born, of tithes, *etc.*, which already belonged to the Lord, the general principle is taught that man may not make that a matter of extraordinary piety which already forms a part of his ordinary duty. In a sense this would absolutely exclude all vows, since the Christian requirement is that we should devote ourselves with all that we have to Him who gave Himself for us, and indeed the highest standard of the Christian life, making

of that life itself one perpetual vow, necessarily supercedes all minor vows; but nevertheless practically, special dedications of ourselves and ours may be made, and when made are to be sacredly kept. See Eccl. v. 4, 5.

III. Here as elsewhere Moses is made only the channel and instrument by whom the laws are given; their authorship is expressly referred to the Lord Himself. Accepting this as a truth, the wonderful character of this legislation occasions no difficulty; but if with the negative critics, it be denied and the legislation be referred to human authorship, we have in this book the impossible phenomenon of a legislation wholly occupied with the promotion of holiness, and yet stamped with fraud and deliberate forgery upon its very front. We have also a legislation far superior to that of any nation of antiquity, and indeed morally superior to any that has ever existed except under the influence of Christianity, proceeding from a people whose history shows them to have been unfitted for the conception, much more the enactment of even a very inferior code.

HOMILETICAL AND PRACTICAL.

Lange: "The religious observance of vows. Before all things man must not be willing to cheat Jehovah; also he must be thoroughly honest and true in his vows, his professions, his fasts, his devotion, and his religious duties generally."

Also under exegetical: "The importance of these prescriptions is that they oppose all unmanliness in relation to a pledged word, confirmation vows, marriage vows, ordination vows, false discharge of fasting that has been vowed by fish-eating and the like; the removal of all evasions of criminal justice and of churchly discipline, and finally, of all frauds in regard to the duties which one owes to the cultus and to the religious rights of the community. The ordinance concerning the irremissibility of various actions shows clearly that there can be a true freedom within this obligation. The sanctification of manliness—thus might the whole section be entitled."

Also under the same: "It is an old story that worldliness, cunning, and impiety, very willingly put obstructions in the way of religious, theocratic, and ecclesiastical discharge of duty, and the complaints of the Old Testament of the want of manliness in this matter, which was connected with dimness of faith in the Omniscient, have been continually repeated even to the present. But here Jehovah, who deals faithfully and reliably with His holy people, approaches with the demand in regard to them, that they should hold themselves holy, and faithful, and trustworthy in all their business in regard to Him. If moral laxity begins first in concealments in relation to God and His institutions, it will diffuse itself more widely until it completes its process of dissolution in religious and moral deceptions, especially in the province of all religious and moral vows."

THE END.

GEORGE SMITH'S NEW STANDARD WORKS.

The Chaldean Account of Genesis.

CONTAINING THE DESCRIPTION OF THE CREATION, THE FALL OF MAN, THE DELUGE, THE TOWER OF BABEL, THE TIMES OF THE PATRIARCHS, AND NIMROD; BABYLONIAN FABLES, AND LEGENDS OF THE GODS FROM THE CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS.

By GEORGE SMITH,

Of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, Author of "History of Assurbanipal," "Assyrian Discoveries," Etc.

With numerous Illustrations. 1 vol., 8vo..... ....$4.00.

MR. SMITH'S first volume, *Assyrian Discoveries*, attracted wide attention from all Biblical students, because of the important bearing of the discoveries it recorded upon the accuracy of the narrative of the creation, as rehearsed in Genesis. Here Mr. Smith summarizes the results of still later and more comprehensive researches. The inscriptions which he has deciphered cover a wide range of subjects, as will be seen from the title of the volume, and are of the most marked significance and of the highest importance.

FROM THE ENGLISH REVIEWS.

"A step, the importance of which cannot be overlooked, has been made in a study which has a religious as well as a literary value."—*Times.*

"The work Mr. Smith has here given us is the most interesting and the fullest we have yet had from his pen.....In concluding these remarks, we heartily commend Mr. Smith's work to the attention of every one who, accepting the general course of Biblical story, would wish to learn all that can be at present told of the collateral, though not contemporaneous, history of Chaldea and Babylonia."—*Atheneum.*

"Probably no single volume of its kind was ever published that contained more singular and deeply interesting matter."—*Nonconformist.*

A NEW EDITION NOW READY OF

Assyrian Discoveries.

An Account of Explorations and Discoveries on the Site of Nineveh during 1873 and 1874.

By GEORGE SMITH,

Of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum.

With Maps, Wood-Cuts, and Photographs. One vol., 8vo, cloth, $4.00.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

From the N. Y. Daily Tribune.

"Mr. Smith appears to have engaged in his work with equal ardor, perseverance, and good judgment. His habits as a scholar have not impaired his efficiency as a practical man. The recital of his experience is marked by frankness, modesty, and great intelligence."

From the St. Louis Democrat.

"The book reveals much of the hitherto hidden history of the Assyrian empire, and shows that its people were wise in many things. The maxims translated from the records, and the curious devices and pictures brought to the earth's surface, give us a clearer knowledge of the character of the people that inhabited that nation than we have gained from any other source. * * * It is a work of great importance, and will be welcomed by all scholars and antiquaries."

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

"Mr. Smith's book is in clearness and accuracy all that could be wished; himself a great authority on Assyrian antiquities, he has prepared a work which no person who has studied or intends to study this fascinating subject should fail to read."

From the Cincinnati Commercial.

"It is in the hope that these rich, first fruits of investigation will stimulate inquiry, and induce the British Government to take hold of the matter, and bring its influence to bear in such a manner upon the Ottoman Government as to secure its coöperation in prosecuting a thorough system of investigation, that we close Mr. Smith's absorbingly interesting book."

From the Watchman and Reflector.

"His book is a simple, straightforward record of what he accomplished, written not to catch the applause of the ignorant, but to inform the wise and the thoughtful. The narrative of personal experience is interesting, without trace of straining for sensational effect. But the chief value of the work is for its account of things accomplished."

Either of the above will be sent, prepaid, upon receipt of price, by

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.,

743 & 745 Broadway New York.

LANGE'S COMMENTARY,

Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical.

TRANSLATED, ENLARGED, AND EDITED

—BY—

PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.,

Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THIS great work is rapidly approaching completion. The New Testament Part is finished. The Old Testament Part is more than half done.

The German work, on which the English edition is based, is the product of about twenty distinguished Biblical scholars, of Germany, Holland, and Switzerland, and enjoys a high reputation and popularity wherever German theology is studied.

The American edition is not a mere translation (although embracing the whole of the German), but to a large extent, an *original* work; about one-third of the matter being added, and the whole adapted to the wants of the English and American student.

The press has been almost unanimous in its commendation of LANGE'S COMMENTARY. It is generally regarded as being, on the whole, the most useful Commentary, especially for ministers and theological students—in which they are more likely to find what they desire than in any other. It is a complete treasure of Biblical knowledge, brought down to the latest date. It gives the results of careful, scholarly research; yet in a form sufficiently popular for the use of intelligent laymen. The Homiletical department contains the best thoughts of the great divines and pulpit orators of all ages on the texts explained, and supplies rich suggestions for sermons and Bible lectures.

The following are some of the chief merits of this Commentary:

1. It is orthodox and sound, without being sectarian or denominational. It fairly represents the exegetical and doctrinal *consensus* of evangelical divines of the present age, and yet ignores none of the just claims of liberal scientific criticism.

2. It is comprehensive and complete—giving in beautiful order the authorized English version with emendations, a digest of the Critical Apparatus, Exegetical Explanations, Doctrinal and Ethical Inferences and Reflections, and Homiletical and Practical Hints and Applications.

3 It is the product of about forty American (and a few British) Biblical Scholars, from all the leading denominations and Theological and Literary institutions of the United States. Professors in the Theological Seminaries of New York, Princeton, Andover, New Haven, Hartford, Cambridge, Rochester, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Alleghany, Chicago, Madison, and other places, representing the Presbyterian, Episcopal, Congregational, Baptist, Methodist, Lutheran, and Reformed Churches, have contributed or are engaged now in contributing to this Commentary. It may, therefore, claim a national character more than any other work of the kind ever published in this country.

For Names of Contributors, Volumes issued, etc., see next page.

LIST OF AMERICAN CONTRIBUTORS TO LANGE'S COMMENTARY.

Prof PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., *GENERAL EDITOR,* **Union Theo'l Sem'y, N. Y**

Prof. CHARLES A. AIKEN, D. D.,..Presbyterian,...Theo'l Seminary, Princeton, N. J
Rev. S. R. ASBURY,.....Episcopalian,.....Moorestown, N. J
Prof. GEORGE BLISS, D. D.,.....Baptist, ...Lewisburg University, Pa
Rev. CHARLES A. BRIGGS,.....Presbyterian,..... .....Roselle, N. J
Prof. JOHN A. BROADUS, D. D.,..Bapt.,...Greenville Theo'l Sem'y, South Carolina
Rev. T. W. CHAMBERS, D. D.,....Reformed.....New York.
Rev. THOS. C. CONANT, D. D.,....Baptist.....Brooklyn, L. I.
Rev. E. R. CRAVEN, D. D.,.....Presbyterian,.....Newark, N. J.
Prof GEORGE E. DAY, D. D.,.....Congregational,...Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Prof. CHAS. ELLIOTT, D. D.,.....Presb.,.....N. W. Theo'l Sem'y, Chicago, Ills.
Prof. L J. EVANS, D. D.,.....Presb.,.....Lane Theo'l Seminary, Cincinnati, O.
Prof. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D. D.,.Presb.....Prin. Free College, Glasgow, Scotland
Prof. JOHN FORSYTH, D. D.,.....Reformed, Chapl'n Mil'y Acad., West Point, N.Y.
Prof. FRED. GARDINER, D. D.,...Epis.,...Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Ct.
Rev. A. GOSMAN, D. D.,..... .....Presbyterian,..... .....Lawrenceville, N. J.
Prof. W. H. GREEN, D. D.,.....Presbyterian,...Theo'l Seminary, Princeton, N. J.
Prof. H. B. HACKETT, D. D.,.....Baptist,.....Rochester University, N. Y.
Rev. E. HARWOOD, D. D.,.....Episcopal,.....New Haven, Ct.
Prof. W. H. HORNBLOWER, D. D., Presbyterian,.....Theo'l Sem'y, Alleghany, Pa.
Prof. J. F. HURST, D. D.,.....Methodist,...Drew Theo'l Sem'y, Madison, N. J.
Prof. A. C. KENDRICK, D. D.,.....Baptist,.....Rochester University, N. Y.
Rev. JOHN LILLIE, D. D.,.....Presbyterian, ...(Deceased.)
Rev. J. FRED. McCURDY,.....Presbyterian,.....Princeton, N. J.
Prof. C. M. MEAD, D. D.,..... .....Congregational,....Theo'l Sem'y Andover, Mass.
Rev. J. ISIDOR MOMBERT, D. D., Episcopal,... .....Dresden, Germany.
Miss EVELINE MOORE,.....Presbyterian,.....Newark, N. J.
Prof. MURPHY, D. D.,.....Presbyterian,...Queen's College, Belfast, Ireland.
Prof. J. PACKARD, D. D.,.....Episcopal,.....Theo'l Sem'y, Alexandria, Va.
Prof. D. W. POOR, D. D.,.....Presbyterian,..... ...San Francisco, Cal.
Prof. M. B. RIDDLE, D. D.,.....Reformed,... Theological Seminary, Hartford, Ct.
Prof. CH. F. SCHAEFFER, D. D.,..Luth.,.....Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.
Prof. W. G. T. SHEDD, D. D., ...Presbyterian,....Union Theo'l Sem'y, New York.
Rev. C. C. STARBUCK,.....Congregational,.....Berea College Ky.
Prof. P. H. STEENSTRA,.....Episcopal,....Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.
Prof. CALVIN E. STOWE, D. D.,..Congregational,.....formerly of Andover, Mass.
Prof. JAS. STRONG, D. D.,.....Methodist,.....Drew Seminary, Madison, N. J.
Prof. W. G. SUMNER,.....Episcopal,..... Yale College, New Haven, Ct.
Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D.,.....Reformed,.....Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Prof. C. H. TOY, D. D., ...Baptist,.....Greenville Sem'y, South Carolina.
Rev. E. A. WASHBURN, D. D.,....Episcopal,.....Rector Calvary Church, New York.
Prof. WILLIAM WELLS,.....Methodist,....Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.
Rev. C P. WING, D. D.,.....Presbyterian,.....Carlisle, Pa.
Rev. E. D. YEOMANS, D. D.,.....Presbyterian,.....(Deceased.)

There have been thus far issued of LANGE'S COMMENTARY, NINE Volumes on the Old Testament, and TEN on the New Testament, as follows:

OLD TESTAMENT VOLUMES.

I. GENESIS.
II. EXODUS and LEVITICUS.
III. JOSHUA, JUDGES, and RUTH.
IV. ACTS.
V. JOB.
VI. PSALMS.
VII. PROVERBS, SONG OF SOLOMON, ECCLESIASTES.
VIII. JEREMIAH and LAMENTATIONS.
IX. THE MINOR PROPHETS.

In preparation.—Numbers and Deuteronomy (1 vol.); I. and II. Samuel (1 vol.); Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther (1 vol.); Isaiah (1 vol.); Ezekiel and Daniel (1 vol.).

NEW TESTAMENT VOLUMES.

I. MATTHEW.
II. MARK and LUKE.
III. JOHN.
IV. ACTS.
V. ROMANS.
VI. CORINTHIANS.
VII. GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, and COLOSSIANS.
VIII. THESSALONIANS, TIMOTHY, TITUS, PHILEMON, HEBREWS.
IX. JAMES, PETER, JOHN, and JUDE.
X. REVELATION. WITH AN INDEX TO NEW TESTAMENT VOLS.

It will be observed that the New Testament portion is complete.

Each one vol. 8vo. Price per vol. in half calf, $7.50; in Sheep, $6.50; in Cloth, $5.00.

Any or all the volumes of LANGE'S COMMENTARY sent, post or express charges paid, to any address on receipt of the price.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.

STANDARD WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION.

By GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College, author of "The Supernatural Origin of Christianity," &c. One vol. 8vo, cloth.....$3 00

This is a concise but complete History of the Reformation, as a whole, and in all the countries to which it extended, embracing a full account of its causes, events, characters, and consequences. It is lucid and graphic in style, and, as Professor FISHER has made the Reformation the study of his life, the work displays throughout a thoroughness of research which must make it a standard authority upon the important movement to the history of which it is devoted.

JOWETT'S DIALOGUES OF PLATO.

Four vols. crown 8vo cloth, per set, cheaper edition.....$8 00

This work, by Prof. JOWETT, is one of the most splendid and valuable gifts to Literature and Philosophy that have for a long time been offered. Its first or most obvious excellence is the perfect ease and grace of the translation, which is thoroughly English, and yet entirely exempt from any phrase or feature at variance with the Hellenic character. Very few translations, other than the Bible, read like an original; but this is one of them. It has other and more recondite excellences. It is the work, almost the life-labor, we believe, of a profound scholar, a thoughtful moralist and metaphysician, and a most successful instructor of youth; and it is manifest that the complete success that has attended his execution of the task is itself the means of concealing the diligence, industry, and ability with which philological and interpretative difficulties must have been solved or overcome.—*Blackwood's Magazine.*

FROUDE'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

Complete in Twelve Volumes, Crown Octavo.

THE CHELSEA EDITION. Half roan, gilt top, per set.....$21 00
THE POPULAR EDITION. Twelve vols., cloth.....15 00

"The style is excellent; sound, honest, forcible, singularly perspicuous English; at times, with a sort of picturesque simplicity, pictures dashed off with only a few touches, but perfectly alive. . . . . We have never read a passage twice. . . . . We see the course of events day by day, not only of the more serious and important communications, but the gossip of the hour. . . . . If truth and vivid reality be the perfection of history, much is to be said in favor of this mode of composition."—*London Quarterly.*

FROUDE'S HISTORY OF IRELAND.

THREE VOLUMES NOW READY. On tinted paper, cloth.....$7 50

FROUDE'S SHORT STUDIES.

FIRST AND SECOND SERIES.

POPULAR EDITION. Two vols., cloth.....$3 00
CHELSEA EDITION. Two vols., half Roxburg, gilt top.....4 00

MOMMSEN'S HISTORY OF ROME.

REPRINTED FROM THE REVISED LONDON EDITION. Four vols. crown 8vo. Per set.....$8 00

"A work of the very highest merit; its learning is exact and profound; its narrative full of genius and skill. Its descriptions of men are admirably vivid. We wish to place on record our opinion that Dr. Mommsen's is by far the best history of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Commonwealth."—*London Times.*

CURTIUS' HISTORY OF GREECE.

Printed upon Tinted Paper, uniform with MOMMSEN'S HISTORY OF ROME, and the Library Edition of FROUDE'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.

Five volumes crown 8vo, per vol.....$2.50

"Professor CURTIUS' eminent scholarship is a sufficient guarantee for the trustworthiness of his history, while the skill with which he groups his facts, and his effective mode of narrating them, combine to render it no less readable than sound. Professor Curtius everywhere maintains the true dignity and impartiality of history, and it is evident his sympathies are on the side of justice, humanity, and progress."—*London Athenæum.*

"We can not express our opinion of Dr. Curtius' book better than by saying that it may be fitly ranked with Theodor Mommsen's great work."—*London Spectator.*

These books sent post-paid, upon receipt of the price, by the publishers.

SCRIBNER, ARMSTRONG & CO., NEW YORK.

DATE DUE

DEC 2 1 1978

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

16462YH 1077
LBC
07-10-03 32180 MC

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01276 1765